IN THIS VICTORY: WHIGS, TORIES, GREECE, AND THE ENGLISH CONSTITUTION

A thesis presented to the faculty of the Graduate School of Western Carolina University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of a Masters of Arts in History.

By

John David Scott

Director: Dr. David Dorondo
Associate Professor of History
History Department

Committee Members: Dr. Robert Clines, History
Dr. Laura Cruz, History

April 2015

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee members for their assistance in writing this work. In particular Dr. Cruz; who gave helped me get a passing grade on my first undergraduate paper and therefore made this all possible; Dr. Clines, without whose intellectual assistance I would not have passed; and Dr. Dorondo, who, throughout my career as an undergraduate and graduate student, provided the necessary moral encouragement which has made my success possible.

Furthermore, I would like to thank my father for helping me financially and my mother for her hours of work as editor and writing mentor. *Dei gratia.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

IN THIS VICTORY: WHIGS, TORIES, GREECE, AND THE ENGLISH CONSTITUTION

John David Scott, M.A.

Western Carolina University (April 2015)

Director: Dr. David Dorondo

After the end of the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars, two parties in England, the Whigs and the Tories, engaged in a rhetorical debate over the dominant interpretation of the English Constitution. The Tories defended an interpretation which saw sovereignty as something alienable from the people, legitimacy as a legally established foundation, and Christianity as both hierarchical and structural to government. The Whigs sought to supplant this view of the Constitution with another that saw sovereignty as inalienable from the people, legitimacy as a consensually given opinion, and Christianity as both egalitarian and outside of government. This constitutional debate had been ongoing since 1688 in one form or another. After the end of the Napoleonic Wars, both parties augmented their arguments by attempting to show how events on the continent of Europe both proved their own interpretation right and proved the other party's interpretation wrong. All of this intersected with an even longer established English philhellenism when the Greeks began their own revolution against the Ottoman Empire in 1821. The Whigs, already characterizing the European monarchies as tyrannical, gained the upper hand over the Tories with the advent of the Greek Revolution. Because the Tories were unable to successfully argue that the Ottoman Turks ought to be considered the rightful rulers over the Greeks, the Tories were unable to defend themselves from Whig attempts to cast them as supporters of literal oriental tyranny. In the end, the ultimate results of the Whig victory over the

Tories were more than a political success. History has too often remembered the Whig accomplishment as the inevitable triumph of liberalism and democracy, just as Greece is remembered as the founder of the same ideals. The Whig attempts to meld their own goals concerning the English Constitution to the long believed-in legacy of Greece, outlined in this work, proved a successful tipping point in their project to discredit the established church and state of England. The tragedy of the Whig success lay in the results of their victory, which made absurd a long legitimate view of the English state and Orientalized a great deal of English history.

INTRODUCTION

"I dream'd that Greece might still be free;/ For standing on the Persians' grave,/ I could not deem myself a slave." These lines, the words of George Gordon Lord Byron, capture well the European fascination with Ancient Greece. It is perhaps unbearably trite to begin a work with Byronic poetry, even if it seeks, in some part, to analyze some part of this fascination. Then again, it would, perhaps, be unforgivable to write anything on the topic without at least once mentioning Lord Byron and his poetry. Byron wrote these lines in the third canto of *Don Juan*, his last epic poem that many regard as his magnum opus. In the third canto, the eponymous hero washes ashore on a Greek island and, as a means of entertaining his host, he recites a poem. This poem within a poem, *The Isles of Greece*, celebrates the ancient heritage of Greece, the land of freedom and glory. Don Juan alternates between calling for a new exertion of Greek vigor—"Of the three hundred grant but three,/ To make a new Thermopylae!—and lamenting those who "fill high the cup with Samian wine" and thereby forget their noble heritage in a haze of wine fumes.[1]

Of the many things which can be said about Lord Byron, and assuredly have been said, not the least worthy of them is that he actively tried to help the Greeks win freedom from the Turkish Empire. He died in the siege of Messolonghi in 1824. He was the most prominent European philhellene to die for the cause of the Greeks, but he was far from the only one. Philhellenism was, from the beginning of the Greek War of Independence in 1821 to its end in 1832, a vast, pan-European movement. Englishmen, Frenchmen, Germans, Swiss, Americans, Russians, and Italians all travelled to Greece to fight for the Greeks. Others floated loans to

[1] George Byron, "Modern History Sourcebook: Lord Byron: The Isles of Greece," *Fordham University*, November 1998. March 31, 2015, http://legacy.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/byron-greece.asp.

finance the war. Frank Hastings built the Karteria, one of the first steamships used in active military serve, and he commanded her in the service of the Greek navy.[2] To quote David Brewer in his book, *The Greek War of Independence*, the Greek Revolution connected a Pole from a Mississippi riverboat, a "watchmaker's apprentice from Alsace who pretended to be dumb and deaf," and a murderous Italian from the Piedmont fleeing his dastardly act. All these characters came together on a ship to Greece.[3] In short, the Greek Revolution had a cultural and social impact on all of Europe—the entire continent held its collective breath as the prospect of a new Thermopylae won by the new Greeks against the new Persians promised to regenerate the freedom of all nations over and above their tyrannical rulers. This hoped for rebirth was, perhaps, the most important aspect of philhellenism, and although philhellenism might have reached a climax of furor in the 1820s, the love of things Greek had long affected all the European states. It will be the goal of this work to look at the intersection of English philhellenism, amplified enormously by the Greek Revolution, and the efforts of a particular English party to create a constitutional crisis in the years immediately after the end of the Napoleonic wars. The Whigs, and their supporters in the press, used several continental events in an attempt to shift the dominant interpretation of the English Constitution, and in many ways the Greek Revolution was the most useful.

As a brief instance of this, one can take as an example an anonymous author who, writing in *The British Review and London Critical*, took up the cause of the Greeks. The way in which he defended the Greek cause was also an attack against the principles of the Tory Ministry. The Turks, wrote this author, were the worst of animals. In their rule over the Greeks, they had been

[2] William St. Clair, *That Greece Might Still Be Free* (London: Oxford University Press, 1972), 295-296.
[3] David Brewer, *The Greek War of Independence: The Struggle for Freedom from Ottoman Oppression,* (New York: Overlook Duckworth, 2011), 137.

no better than slave masters. They had utterly destroyed every prospect for the happiness of their so-called subjects. The brutal nature of their religion left no doubt as to their true essence.[4] What then was the issue? Why had not England, indeed all of Europe risen up in thorough disapprobation and executed judgment against the Turks? The author feared it was a question of legality—a woefully misapplied legality. It could be shown, the author went on to say, that the governments of Europe approached the question according to "the exploded principles of passive obedience and non-resistance carried to their extreme in the annihilation of the rights of nature."[5] Turkish tyranny was directly analogous to the tyranny of James II, "the gradual advances…towards the revival of popery and absolute monarchy."[6] The Greek revolt then was a legal, just, *rightful* assertion of freedom every bit as dire as and directly analogous to the English revolution of 1688.

The Greek Revolution and the reaction it inspired in England and throughout Europe has often been the focus of historical works. In the words of Terrance Spencer, Philhellenism, and the Greek Revolution in particular, deserves attention because "it is one of the very clear instances of a meeting-point between literature and action."[7] English literature, most spectacularly in Lord Byron's poems, certainly inspired a popular movement which had a direct effect on the action of the English government resulting in the establishment of an independent

[4] Anon, "Greece," *The British Review and London Critical* 21, no. 42 (1824): 295.
[5] Ibid., 297-298.
[6] Ibid., 299.
[7] Terence Spencer, *Fair Greece, Sad Relic: Literary Philhellenism from Shakespeare to Byron* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1954), vii. Spencer notes that the English literary world had long been conditioned to accept the modern Greeks as the direct descendants of those worthy ancients who had bequeathed to civilization all that was worthy in it. Literary Philhellenism went back much further than Byron or Shelley. It is difficult to overestimate the political advantage the Whigs were able to make of the entire body of Philhellene admiration for Greece. It was an admiration that the Tories shared as well. Forced by the exigencies of the international situation and the Whigs' political stance, the Tories attempted to take a stand against rebellion while also hoping the best for Greece. In no small part, Philhellenism made this a difficult stance to take.

Greece. To what extent is, of course, arguable. Many studies have gone over this ground and placed Greece and Philhellenism in different relative positions of importance. C.M. Crawley, in his study of British foreign policy in the east, wrote that even though the Philhellenes achieved few concrete results, they did focus "the interest of Europe upon the struggle."[8] Gary Bass, in his book *Freedom's Battle*, identifies Philhellenism as one of the first international movements fighting for the cause of humanity.[9] These subjects, important to the universe of this work, will not, however, be its main historical focus. This work will focus, in part, on the rhetorical efforts of the Whigs to use continental political events generally and Greece especially to further their own political goals. If the Greek Revolution can provide a link between rhetoric and politics—as philhellenism provided an impetus for action abroad—then the rhetorical uses of Greece could be linked to the broader redefinition of the English Constitution which culminated in 1832.

To return to the brief example taken from the above primary source, the author in *The British Review,* by connecting Turkish tyranny with a long deposed English king and Greek successes with the providential hand of God, was making an argument about the English Constitution. He espoused arguments using words which had long been active in English political debate, and he added to them the weight of a classical and Christian Greece. He did this in order to further his own political views and the views of one particular party and one particular Constitutional interpretation. It is a claim of this work that the Greek Revolution of

[8] C.M. Crawley, *The Question of Greek Independence: A study of British Policy in the Near East, 1821-1833* (New York: Howard Fertig, 1973), 13.

[9] Gary Bass, *Freedom's Battle: The Origins of Humanitarian Intervention* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2008), 48-49 and throughout Chapter four of his book. Bass argues that the Greek Revolution provided a hot topic issue in the "free press" which had a "tremendous influence" on the upper echelons of English politics. The philhellenes, far to the left of the Tory government, engaged in a war of words against key government figures, such as Lord Castlereagh. Bass implies that the unpopularity of Castlereagh was largely due to his stance on the Greek Revolution and that Castlereagh's suicide can be attributed to the stress of becoming a largely hated man. Byron and Shelley's poetry had a great deal to do with this.

1821, more than other continental events, provided a point of leverage which Whigs were able to effectively use to shift the dominant interpretation of the English Constitution away from that view which the Tories attempted to defend.[10] In other words, the Greek Revolution was a key cog in the Whig project of redefining the English Constitution as contractualist rather than providentialist.

Contractualism and Providentialism had long been two available Constitutional interpretations. A way to illustrate the continued relevance of both viewpoints can be shown through the works of Edmund Burke and Richard Price. In 1789 the debate about the true meaning and rightful interpretation of 1688 had erupted violently after a long dormant period. Many Englishmen eagerly compared their Revolution to the currently evolving French Revolution and some went so far as to encourage emulating the French example.[11] Dr. Richard Price, in a sermon preached to the Revolution Society of London, spoke boldly about what he perceived to be the true principle of 1688. For him, civil laws, government, and magistrates were all human institutions. The year 1688 had been about expelling a cruel tyrant from the land and asserting the rights of the people to choose a sovereign who would best please them; it was about

[10] After 1794, it is possible to speak of two groups of Whigs—those originally led by Charles Fox who remained in opposition to the government and those led by the Duke of Portland who remained in ministerial power. Properly understood, the first division of English politics into two distinct parties belongs to the period of 1688 when the divisive issue of Protestant succession split Parliament into two parties called the Whigs and the Tories. Those men who firmly supported James II's indefeasible right to the throne were Tories, and those who trumpeted instead the importance of a Protestant succession were called Whigs. However, after the final dissolution of the Jacobite threat to the English throne, true Tory ideology was subsumed into mainstream Whig thought. In spite of this, it became a commonplace feature in English political discussion to use the term Tory to describe those ministerial Whigs who remained in government and to use the term Whig to describe only the followers and heirs of Charles Fox who remained outside of ministerial power. Both Portland and Fox could have been, for a time, rightfully described as Whigs. The difference between the men—eventually an unbridgeable gulf—stemmed from the two very different ways they interpreted the English Constitution. For more information see J.C.D. Clark *Reflections in the Revolution in France,* 109 and Clark *English Society* pages 72 and 250. In this work the heirs of Fox who remained outside of ministerial power for much of the selected time period will be referred to as Whigs, while the heirs of Portland who remained in the ministry will be referred to as Tories.

[11] Steven Pincus, *England's Glorious Revolution 1688-1689: A Brief History with Documents* (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2006), 50.

discharging a tyrant whose deposition allowed the formulation of the current English Constitution. It was this Constitution which guaranteed the right of freedom of worship, the right to resist abusive power, and the right to cashier kings for misconduct, in a word, to *choose* a government.[12] Furthermore, Price felt that "it is the end of government to protect [liberty]." Logically, if government had been first instituted by man to protect his own freedom of expression and property, anything which threatened to subvert said freedom made necessary the immediate restructuring of said government to bring it back in line with its *raison d'être*. Such had been 1688. Indeed, if 1688 had been, in its essence, anything different, it would mean that God wanted the principle of government to be founded on rank slavery to his appointed monarch no matter if that monarch meant to cruelly subjugate his people to the most horrid crimes. It would entail a God who "made mankind to be oppressed and plundered."[13]

In a response to Price's sermon, Edmund Burke defended the mainstream view of the English Constitution. Contrary to Price, Burke maintained that if it were possible to distill principles from 1688, such principles would not contain any mention of positive natural rights. The event of 1688 had continued the inextricable bond between the subject and the monarch. Yes, there had been "a small and temporary deviation" from the legal right of succession to the throne, but it would be utter madness to construct from this necessary deviation a positive principle applicable in other circumstances. Burke felt that the men of the Revolution Society "take the deviation from the principle for the principle." If 1688 had been anything other than a necessary deviation, never to be repeated, then it would mean that the entire corpus of English laws—enacted by the hereditary monarchs of England over a course of centuries—would

[12] Ibid., 50-51.
[13] Ibid., 52.

become null and void.[14] While Burke did not disagree with the idea of a contract between ruled and ruler, to him this contract, once affirmed, was unbreakable. Once the people installed their sovereignty in the body of the sovereign, they could not reclaim that sovereignty. The contract was immutable, and sovereignty was a thing alienated from the people.[15] Only God's providential interference justified the acts of 1688: there was no right of resistance.

That these two pre-Revolutionary war viewpoints were largely representative of the two broad Constitutional interpretations after the war will be shown in the first chapter of this work through a selection of post-Revolutionary war periodicals and magazines.[16] These will be as follows: *The Quarterly Review*, *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* (*The Maga*), *The British Critic*, *The Pamphleteer*, *The Edinburgh Review*, and *The Westminster Review*. Three of these

[14] Ibid., 53-54.

[15] Edmund Burke, *Reflections on the Revolution in France: A Critical Edition*, ed. J.C.D. Clark (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001), 42. I am sourcing here from the editor's preface and introduction.

[16] For more information on the Tory, Whig, and Radical press during this time, see Kevin Gilmartin, *Writing Against Revolution*: *Literary Conservatism in Britain 1790-1832*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007 and *Print Politics: The Press and Radical Opposition in Early Nineteenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996). In *Writing Against Revolution*, Gilmartin writes on the topic of what he calls literary conservatism from the end of the French Revolutionary Wars in 1815 to the Reform Bills of 1832. The men and women Gilmarten considers counter-revolutionary often dealt with a common conception that '"The French Revolution might be described as the remote but inevitable result of the invention of the art of printing.'" This antipathy towards the press is certainly typical of the Tories. In spite of these difficulties, Gilmartin maintains that the Tories engaged in an effort to muzzle the press by using the press, in spite of the admitted difficulties of distinguishing between 'good' early constitutional reform (like 1688) and 'bad' reforming tendencies (like the parliamentary reform movement after 1815). According to Gilamartin's scheme, the Tory attempt to write against Greece can be seen as an attempt to "engage directly with those modes of public organization and print communication that were associated with radical protest." Here, however, this work diverges from Gilmartin, who sees the Tory attempt to so engage as a "feature of modernity." This work sees the Whig attempt to use Greece as fitting into and influencing a long extant debate. The press is a new tool used by old actors to settle old scores with new methods. Gilmartin ends his book with the observation that anti-radical movements in England after 1832 "tended to accept the need to engage the common people as a political force, and to operate within a legitimate sphere of extra parliamentary opinion." This may indeed have been the case, and furthermore, it was quite possibly a partial result of the press itself changing the nature of political debate, a la Habermas. But it was still the old questions about sovereignty and legitimacy which required answers. Instead of the English 'ancien régime ' ending, according to Gilmartin, as a result of the failure of a counterrevolutionary enterprise complicated by the duel nature of the press, this work maintains that the failure of the so-called counterrevolutionary enterprise came about because it was no longer possible to hold the necessary beliefs underpinning the Providentialist understanding of the English kingdom.

periodicals were variously Tory in leaning—*The Quarterly Review*, *The Maga*, and *The British Critic*. Representing the Whigs, there is the prolific periodical, *The Edinburgh Review*, and the much more radical *Westminster Review*. Although *The Westminster* is not properly a "Whig" journal, it is important to note that Tory authors certainly believed that the principles of *The Edinburgh Review* and *The Westminster* were one and the same. It is also certain that *The Westminster Review* contributed to the undermining of Tory constitutional interpretation. *The Pamphleteer* published tracts and pamphlets on both sides of the political debate; however, most of the selected tracts support the Whig viewpoint.[17] Despite the certain limitations of these

[17] *The Quarterly Review* was a Tory leaning periodical published beginning in 1809. Its first editor, William Gifford, began it as a Tory rival to the highly successful *Edinburgh Review*. By 1818 it had a circulation of 14,000. John Gibson Lockhart replaced Gifford as editor in 1825. Lockhart was therefore editor during the tumultuous period of English reform, and he proudly kept *The Quarterly* from becoming politically tied to one faction or another during this time. *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, known to its supporters and readers as *The Maga*, began its publication in 1817 in Edinburgh specifically as a rival to *The Edinburgh Review*. It was known for its fiery, biting satirical attacks against anything and everything Whiggish in thought. Numerous lawsuits for slander reached a highpoint in 1821 when a contributor to *The Maga* faced John Scott, a rival from *The London Magazine*, in a duel and killed him. *The Edinburgh Review* was the main Whig periodical, and it started its publication in 1802. Francis Jeffrey, Sidney Smith, and Henry Brougham began the periodical. All three men, but especially Sydney Smith were members of Holland House—that well known den of Whig villainy or virtue, depending on one's outlook. In many ways *The Edinburgh Review* is the most important British periodical ever to have been published because its success ensured a generation of following periodical publications—including its two rivals mentioned above. *The Westminster Review* began its publication run as the latest addition to these other main periodicals, in 1824. It was set up by Jeremy Bentham and his followers and evolved into the main radical periodical of the time, specifically criticizing both the Whig and Tory papers and evoking Utilitarian principles. Its editor, John Bowring was also secretary to the London Greek Committee, a possible reason for the ferocious defense of that organization that the *Westminster* published in the mid-1820s. *The British Critic* was a conservative review journal established in 1793 to combat the evils of the French Revolution. By the end of the French Revolutionary Wars, *The British Critic* was controlled by the High Church group known as the Hackney Phalanx. Their politics, among other things, was High Tory—concerned primarily with defending a view of the Church as a key integral part of the English state—hierarchical and directly blessed by God. Finally, *The Pamphleteer*, not so much a periodical as a compilation of tracts and pamphlets, was republished for the benefit of members of Parliament so that they could keep track of the various arguments set forth in the political press. It was brought out by John Abraham Valpy. For more information on the above information, see "The Oxford Dictionary of National Biographies"—specifically the articles on John Valpy, William Gifford, John Gibson Lockhart, Francis Jeffrey, Sidney Smith, Henry Brougham, William Blackwood, John Bowring, and the Hackney Phalanx. All of these digital periodicals have been retrieved from Google Books due to the generous contribution of the University of Chicago Library, the University of California, Berkley, Library, Stanford University Library, Indiana University Library, Harvard University Library, and others. For more information on the advantages and disadvantages of using digitalized sources, see *The 19th Century Press in the Digital Age* by James Mussel pages 1-3, 26, and *passim*. Mussel argues that it is important to know and understand the process which brought the massive periodical databases into existence because their digitization is a step in their continuing history. That is, the large digital archives are more than containers for artifacts; they are

sources, they provide a good illustration of a rhetorical debate closely connected with the interpretation of the English Constitution. They interacted with politics and with a larger readership. All of these periodicals were both tools wielded by each separate party, commentaries upon and extensions of political beliefs, and entities meant to be consumed and absorbed. After the end of the French Revolution, it is possible through these sources to grasp (in a very limited fashion because of small selection size) two long established divergences of opinion about the English Constitution, and it is possible, additionally, to show a building rhetorical conflict between those two opinions in light of continental politics. Finally, the sources, demonstrating a fascinating intersection of beliefs and conceptions, make it possible to successfully argue that Greece gave the Whigs a powerful weapon in their effort to shift the dominant interpretation of the English Constitution and the English monarchy.

If an argument is to be made about a redefinition or shift of the English Constitution, it is necessary to know from *whence it cometh and whither it goeth*. In other words, the constitutional debates that raged in the English periodicals in the period of the Greek Revolution were inspired

---

artifacts in their own right. Digital reproduction is a blessing, but it can also be dangerous. Both 19th century visual clues and identifiers can be changed or lost entirely. For example, I used a simple keyword search to find the first round of articles and periodicals selected for this work. This method entirely ignored the reproduced indices and other "hard-copy" leftovers in each digitalized source. It was only on my second read-through that I used these indices, and I found several more articles which a simple word search would have left undiscovered. And this is only the first layer of the problem. The large hardcopy volumes of these periodicals which Google digitized were themselves reproductions and compilations published in the later 19th and early 20th century. These are problems which I am not equipped to deal with in their entirety. Mussel's book is an adroit summation of these problems, and it has given me at least an awareness of the difficulties. For more information on the *Edinburgh Review* and the *Quarterly Review*, see *Scotch Reviewers: The Edinburgh Review, 1802-1815* and *Politics and Reviewers: The* Edinburgh *and the* Quarterly *in the early Victorian age*. These books are, for the most part, not looking at the time period of this work directly, and they are more directly concerned with the literary impact of these works and not their politics. For some help in the identification of contributors to *The Quarterly Review* see, *The Quarterly Review Under Gifford* by Hill Shine. Mr. Shine has identified several authors of articles used in this work. For some more information on *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, see the forward to *Blackwood's Magazine, 1817-25: Selections from Maga's Infancy.* For more information on the *Westminster Review*, see *Two Centuries of British Periodicals* by David Fader and George Bornstein and *Benthamite Reviewing. The First Twelve Years of the Westminster Review, 1824-1836* by George Nesbitt.

by the numerous debates in Parliament during the French Revolution and before. Chapter one of this work will seek to elucidate the nature and relationship of these constitutional debates in the years after the French Revolutionary wars in order to set the intellectual landscape which founds the rest of the work.[18] There is no manifesto of either party—clearly drawn postulates to which allegiance is given. Therefore, as a first step, the existence of these two views will be shown, as clearly as is possible, in the sources. In order to achieve this, this work will seek out Tory and Whig versions of three things: Sovereignty, Legitimacy, and Christianity—all found within the limiting factor of six different English periodical journals. Each party defended a viewpoint, a corpus of beliefs and arguments, with vastly different definitions and interpretations of these three things, and, equally important, each maintained that their view was the only true and rightful heir to the true Constitution and to 1688. Understanding the foundations upon which the Tory and Whig arguments stand is a necessary step towards substantiating the claim that the Whigs were able to use Greece to support their own views and to attack the Tory view.

If it is true that the dominant interpretation of the English Constitution did not change substantially between 1688 and the end of the French Revolution, despite the continued existence of alternative interpretations, then how was it that the Whigs were able to effect any change at all? Chapter two will demonstrate a rhetorical conflict between the Whigs and the Tories. If the Whigs were able to use the Greek Revolution as a rhetorical tool, it was because the Revolution did not emerge into a vacuum. Rather the Greek Revolution broke out at a time when the Whigs were already in the midst of battle with the Tories over the correct meaning of the Constitution,

[18] Technically, the French Revolutionary wars ended with the Peace of Amiens in 1802. The next war, beginning immediately afterwards, is called the Napoleonic War. However, for the convenience of this work, the French Revolutionary wars will be counted as including the Napoleonic Wars and as ending in 1815. This is because a key contention of the Tory party was that the wars were, in fact, the same. The now accepted usage is, perhaps, reflective of the defeat of Tory doctrine.

and it was this pre-existing situation which facilitated the eventual Whig monopoly over the rhetorical tool of Greece.

Both the Whigs and the Tories sought to define what the English Constitution should be in light of continental events variously described as crises. For the Tories, there was an ever growing chance of another revolutionary upheaval like the French Revolution, and continental events not only proved this, they also proved that the Whigs were complicit to them. In much the same way, the Whigs saw the Tories as part of a system of tyranny on the continent coming in part from Napoleon and culminating in the despotic monarchies of Europe. Heightened rhetorical conflict in both party-presses before and during the Greek Revolution created an environment which made it possible for the Whigs to use the Greek fight against Ottoman tyranny to their own ends. Through a number of foreign and domestic events both before and during the Greek Revolution, it is possible to trace the rhetorical attempt of both parties' presses to prove the guilt of the other party and their interpretation, while at the same time, showing the virtue of their own party and interpretation. It is the growth of this rhetorical conflict which made it possible for Greece to serve the purpose of shifting the English Constitution.

Finally, in Chapter three, the work will turn to an analysis of the usage of the Greek Revolution in the Whig and Tory presses. In many ways, the manner in which the Whigs used Greece to attack Tory ideology is very similar to the ways in which they used other such issues, such as the Spanish Revolution, which will be discussed in Chapter two. The Whig press set about using Greece to prove ministerial tyranny, and the ministry press countered by attempting to associate Greece and Grecian supporters with the disease of the French Revolution. However, there were several key differences inherent in the Greek conflict which both proved an additional advantage to the Whigs and their viewpoint while making it difficult for the Tories to defend

themselves and their ideology. Chapter three will seek to identify these differences in order to prove the importance of considering the Greek Revolution a part of the rhetorical leverage the Whig party and press used in order to shift the interpretation of the English Constitution away from the Providential interpretation to the Contractual one.

An unnamed reviewer, writing in the *The British Critic*, quoted with pleased eagerness a portion of his reviewed work: "'Let me be the maker of your popular songs and I will be the maker of your people'…hath been said with some show of justice. But with more reason might it be asserted, let me be the writer of your Newspapers and I will have your form of Government at my disposal."[19] The Greek Revolution was many things, not the least of which, a violent conflict which birthed the modern Greek nation. One of the things it was used for, however, was as a tool in these newspapers and periodicals—a sword-breaker meant to catch and neutralize the foundations of Tory arguments. Voltaire once said that "Whoever is able to make you absurd is able to make you unjust."[20] The Constitutional re-interpretation was the project of one party in England who assembled a rhetorical force of argument just powerful enough to render absurd what had once been truth and paint ridiculous what had once been rational. The victory of the Whig party eventually became the triumph of the Whig interpretation—in politics, society, and history. It ought better to be remembered as a tragedy.

[19] Anon, "Burgess's Reflections on the Spirit of the Times," *The British Critic* 14, (1820): 555.

[20] "*Certainement qui est en droit de vous rendre absurde est en droit de vous rendre injuste*." Voltaire, *Questions sur les Miracles* (Oxford: Sr. Henry Dashwood, 1765), 61. Retrieved from Google Books.

CHAPTER ONE: HOW FIRM THE FOUNDATIONS, CONSTITUTIONAL RHETORIC 1815-1830

England has no Constitution as such. There is no singular document to which legislators can refer. Instead the English Constitution is a corpus of ideas and doctrines, laws and traditions. There is no one place to which one can go to see a list of those laws, promulgations, decrees, dictates or conventions which do or do not make up the laws of England. It is an unwritten constitution. As such, determining exactly what it "says" at any given moment—i.e. what the correct interpretation of the Constitution allows or does not allow is a daunting prospect. Nevertheless, such an attempt must be made, for if an argument is to be sustained that the Greek Revolution of 1821 was, in part, a tool used to shift the dominant, accepted interpretation of the Constitution, then it is necessary to know what that dominant interpretation was and just what interpretation the Greek revolution helped it to shift towards. Often the sources analyzed do not directly discuss the English Constitution. Rather they discuss various sub-issues—such as the location of Sovereignty, the establishment of Legitimacy, and the role of Christianity. Each party championed a viewpoint with widely differing views of these three issues. The Tories defended a providential constitution with a sovereignty alienable from the people, a legal legitimacy, and a Christianity forming a structural part of a hierarchically understood government and society. The Whigs espoused a contractual constitution with a sovereignty inalienable from the people, a legitimacy consensually given, and a Christianity outside of government and far more egalitarian in nature.

How firm was each party's conception of these three issues and how firm their interpretation are shown in the writings of each press. In order to understand how it was that various continental events and especially the Greek Revolution effected change, it is necessary to outline these foundations. The Whigs used Greece as a solvent directed against the Tory Constitution, alienable sovereignty, legal legitimacy, and hierarchically minded church ecclesiology and doctrine. All of these concepts had been dominant in England over the past one hundred years. They are the views which Burke held up against Price. At the end of the French Revolutionary wars, politicians, journalists, and churchmen defended them again against the project of an antithetical and hostile party and, while certainly fighting at a great disadvantage, they were not defeated in this Tory interpretation from lack of trying.

In 1816 an article in *The British Critic* wrote in defense of the Jacobite cause. King James II and his direct heirs had been dead for nearly a decade, and the last true threat of a Jacobite restoration had failed in 1745. These facts made room for the author to lament Jacobitism; however, his reason for doing so was perhaps betrayed when he began to lambast an article recently written in the Whig *Edinburgh Review*.[21] Whig principles would inculcate the right of cashiering kings, and this is not at all what the English state is about. In the mind of this author, the revolution of 1688 had in no way established such principles. The "blessing of Providence" had secured a safe change of dynasty. Furthermore, Providence "guid[ed] the affairs" of all men: what better proof could there be than that safe and wonderful way in which the House of Hannover continued their rule over England even in the face of a firm, if misguided, attachment to the former dynasty.[22] Providence thus proved that Stuart designs for the throne and people of England were not truly sanctioned. Princes would now know that "they

[21] Anon, "The Culloden Papers," *The British Critic* 6, (1816): 156.
[22] "The Culloden Papers," 155, 164-165.

cannot always sport with impunity…with the rights of their subjects." This is all well and good. However, the author immediately followed his analysis with a stern warning:

> But let not subjects, on the other hand, cherish needless asperity, invidious scrutiny and malignant censure. Loyalty to the Prince renders subjection to the law not only easy, but delightful. It is one of the best bonds of society, at once a means of security to the Sovereign, and of happiness and tranquility [sic] to the subject.[23]

Loyalty to the sovereign is a means of peace and security to society as a whole. Without question this is a message born in the aftermath of the French Revolution. It is also an insight into the Tory conception of sovereignty. The people, or subjects, certainly have rights. The providential succession of the Hanoverian monarchy, in the face of obstinate misplaced loyalty, proved that to be the case. However, it could never be true that the rights of the subjects obviated the rights of the sovereign over his subjects. The king, in this article, is no mere representative of the governed; he has rights of his own, established lawfully. From this interpretation of 1688, it is clear that sovereignty still resides in a place, if not wholly separate from the governed populace, nevertheless, far from the general mass of the people.

Whig views of 1688 turned the issue in the exact opposite way. An article in *The Westminster Review*, greatly upset at the actions of the restored Bourbon monarchy in France, complained that the actions of all monarchs proved the entire system of monarchical rule defective. The author felt that the failed restoration of the "miserable James" had now been presented to Europe as if it had in fact succeeded in the person of the French monarch—a prevaricating cheat and liar. Only in "those fortunate countries where the royal purity is strongly guarded by the hedge of popular control" could anything else be expected. For if there was no

[23] "The Culloden Papers," 165.

such hedge, the result was that all men were "born thralls" According to the author, most monarchies got it all wrong: there must be obligations and penalties on both sides of the issue.[24] Another article, by William Peter writing in *The Pamphleteer*,[25] proclaimed that the current dynasty of England owed "ITS VERY BIRTH AND BEING TO THE FREE VOICE AND ELECTION OF THE PEOPLE."[26] Furthermore, it was "but common justice and common reason, that those who were subject to the laws should have a voice in their enactment."[27] Anything or anyone who tried to controvert this tried to make government—meant for the benefit of all—into a privately owned domain meant for the benefit of a small group.[28]

Both of these articles made eager reference to the event of 1688 and the deposed dynasty. Interestingly, as can be seen in the article from *The Westminster*, both Whigs and Tories could agree that responsibility went both ways. The author of that article, however, turned what had been a call for obedience to the king in the Tory article to a warning to all monarchs. If a private soldier could be shot for breaking the rules, so too could a king be recalled to a sense of his duty forcibly and violently.[29] To *The Westminster* and to the article by William Peters, 1688 had been just such an act. The people had acted in deposing the Stuart dynasty just as they had most surely acted in placing the new dynasty in power. Ominously, both articles warned kings and rulers who might seek to overstep their bounds. Sovereignty, in the Whig conception of 1688, ultimately stemmed from the people, and, additionally, the warning to future monarchs betrayed the possibility of a reversion of power back to those who originally gave it.

---

[24] Anon, "*Béranger's* Song," *The Westminster Review* 10, no. 19 (1829): 198-199.

[25] William Peter. 1788-1853. Poet and Writer. JP in the Cornwall region of England. Prominent campaigner for Parliamentary Reform. See "Dictionary of National Biography."

[26] William Peter, "Thoughts on the Present Crisis," *The Pamphleteer* 8 no. 15 (1816): 233.

[27] Peter, 246-247.

[28] Peter, 248.

[29] "*Béranger's* Song," 199.

Another theme which elucidates the differences between the Tory and Whig conceptions of sovereignty concerns the international law of nations and the nature of circumstances, if any, which allowed sovereign nations to impinge on the rights of other sovereign nations. Both Whigs and Tories felt that nations ought to be left alone to govern themselves at almost every instance. The rare reasons which justified interference were the only things which truly differed between the two parties.

An article in *The Maga* argued ferociously that the English government had no business whatsoever in going around handing out constitutions to other nations. It was up to each individual nation, the author argued, to decide on whatever government it wanted. If the nation chose tyranny then so be it, "it [had] a right to possess it free from molestation of any other neighbors, provided it not injure its neighbors."[30] Another article in *The Quarterly* stated quite reasonably that everyone seemed to be able to agree that "breach of faith, aggression, [and] imminent danger to the party interfering" gave right for defense and even adjustment of another nation's government.[31] However, the author went on, there were times when a nation promulgated principles which, if established, would result in danger to other nations. Those principles were directly analogous to mutinous military "attack on monarchical institutions."[32] The author in *The Maga* refused to even go as far as this and argued that if any one nation had a right to interfere in the government of another simply because said nation disagreed with the other nation's principles of government, then "there would be no security for any government whatever." Every nation had the right of determining its own government and, as a corollary, it

[30] Anon, "The Faction," *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 22 no. 81 (1827): 417.

[31] Anon, [Robert Hay], "The Crisis of Spain," *The Quarterly Review* 28, no. 56 (1823): 541. (See *The Quarterly Review under Gifford,* page 83 for identification of author.)

[32] Ibid., 541-542.

was impossible for one given nation to know what government another given nation should have.[33] However, the polemical target of the article later became clear when the author cried out against those men in England who wished to see representative government established across Europe. For in a representative government the people must choose their rulers, and they must be capable of doing so. If they were not, and they chose the wrong ruler, then disaster ensued. In any circumstance when all the particulars were not known, then no change ought to be made, for it could not be certain that such a change would benefit the "people at large." These men whom the author attacked used a mere shadowy talisman of liberty to further their own dastardly goals and, most terribly, they wanted to make England into a "despiser of law and right" in doing so.[34]

In much the same light, the Whigs argued that the "independence of governments" was an important concept to defend against intrusion.[35] The law of nations was a law without courtroom and without judge, and only habitual reverence for it secured obedience to it. If once the system began to break down, the whole thing was in jeopardy.[36] The right of interference could only be an extreme exception to the rule, for "no community, which is not independent, can be called a nation; and that the very definition of independence excludes such intervention."[37] Here then is a doctrine of non-interference with the sovereignty of another nation which was quite clearly stated and was similar to the Tory doctrine. The question then became to determine the rules which governed the exceptions. Just as the Tories did, the Whigs could admit and agree upon the right of interference when directly attacked. However, the Whig author of a tract in *The Pamphleteer* felt that the one rule which governed said exception was produced

[33] "The Faction," 417.
[34] "The Faction," 417-418.
[35] Anon, "Spain," *The Westminster Review* 1, no. 1 (1824): 310.
[36] Anon, "Partitions," *The Edinburgh Review* 37, no. 74 (1822): 516.
[37] Anon, "*The Holy Alliance* verses *Spain*," *The Edinburgh Review* 38, no. 75 (1823): 250.

when "an unoffending people solicit[ed] protection from the unjust attacks of foreign or domestic tyranny."[38]

Both Whigs and Tories admitted the right of interference when attacked. Both admitted that any "pre-emptive" attack against another nation or interference in its government must be an extreme exception. Divergence betrayed itself when authors spoke of what object international interference must be directed against. The Tory articles calumniated principles at home and abroad that put monarchical institutions under threat from rebellion and insurrection. The Whig articles maintain that the true threat to international law and sovereignty came from too much tyranny and too little liberty. An article in *The Edinburgh Review* expanded on this threat by pointing out that since "despotism prevails over a far greater number of men than liberty…the practical effect of [Tory] doctrine…would be to reduce all mankind to be at once barbarians and slaves."[39] Tories, on the other hand, argued that "public law [had] nothing to do with forms of government."[40]

Concerning the law of nations, what then might be the difference between Whig and Tory sovereignty? The Whig articles focused on the cruelties and depredations committed against Poland during the French Revolution, against the people of France in 1815, and against the people of Spain in 1823.[41] The circumstances which contravened international sovereignty all had to do with protecting the people from rapacious and tyrannical rulers committing illegal acts. Both Tory articles, however, focused on the legality of the particular government, whatever may be its form. Merely thinking the form of a government despotic gave no right to overthrow that

[38] Peter, 228.
[39] "*The Holy Alliance* verses *Spain*," 251.
[40] Anon, "Battle of Navarino," *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 23 no. 84 (1828): 25.
[41] "Partitions," 516, Peter, 223, "*The Holy Alliance* verses *Spain*," 251.

government, and as *The Maga* argued, any Englishmen who wished to establish a set of rules contravening this would show himself to "despise laws."[42] Interfering with the sovereignty of another nation simply because said nation's government was tyrannical or cruel would immediately embroil England in a long war to eradicate tyranny. Furthermore, mutiny was prelude to revolution, which must be stopped at all cost in order to preserve peace.[43] Whigs allowed an exception to international sovereignty to protect the rights of the people against tyranny while Tories allowed the same exception to protect established government from illegal usurpations and to prevent the spread of insurrection. What these two exceptions betray about each party's own views about the location of sovereignty is not as clear as might be wished; nevertheless, there is, as before, the people on the one side and the monarch on the other.

Tory notions about what might be called the individuality of a given government—that, is, that it is impossible for one nation to rightfully determine the form of another nation's government—are a good starting point for the final theme of analysis concerning Whig and Tory sovereignty. An article in *The Quarterly Review* put it thusly, "Whereever [sic] laws, and constitutions, and forms of government are artificially established, their decay will ensure." Governments must grow "spontaneously" and, alternatively, if they were created from some set principle, different than the actual disposition of the people ruled, they would certainly falter.[44] The author in this article said that when a group of individuals gathered together and consented to government, "each throws into the compact the disposition which nature" gave him.[45] This, in turn, gave a unique flavor to each institution of government. Finally, these institutions—"a

[42] "The Faction," 418.
[43] [Robert Hay], "The Crisis of Spain," 541-542.
[44] Anon, [Richard Chenevix], "England and France," *The Quarterly Review* 25, no. 50 (1821): 539. (See *The Quarterly Review under Gifford*, page 75).
[45] Ibid., 537.

primary result of the minds and hearts…who form them"—created a union between the past and the present. Only in this way could the institutions of government fulfill their purpose. Anything which might alter the institutions and remove them from "the dispositions of their founders" eventually resulted in the destruction of the given government.[46] This is an argument which Burke would have certainly recognized. Government, conceived of in this way, was not something which ought to be changed. It was a compact between past and present. Furthermore, it was certainly true, in the Tory conception of sovereignty, that power never resided in the people. An article in *The British Critic* lamented that the dangers of the English Civil War were returning because the same principles taught then were being taught now. These principles affirmed to the people that they were the source of all authority and better than kings.[47] "The people are constantly assured, that…in *them* the *sovereignty* of the nation resides" (emphasis in text). Such teaching was "treason."[48] Another article, in *The Maga*, stated the issue succinctly and positively—"When the People have, through the Constitution, solemnly divested themselves of the sovereignty, I deny that they have any right to resume it." Compacts must, of their nature, be binding on both the ruler and the ruled.[49] The Tory idea of government constituted sovereignty as something alienated from the people who, although they had possessed sovereignty once, gave it up once and for all when they entered a governmental compact. This compact could never be thought of as simply existing in the present. It also existed in the past as well, and in this way it prescribed action on the present generation.

[46] Ibid., 538-539.
[47] Anon, "Kenny's Principles &c of Pretended Reformers," *The British Critic* 12, (1819): 44, 159.
[48] "Kenny's Principles &c of Pretended Reformers," 165-166.
[49] Anon, "Letter on the Spirit of the Age," *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 28 no. 174 (1830): 901. As a note here, there seems to be a discrepancy in the numbering system of *The Maga*. Number 84, published in 1828, jumps to number 174, published in 1830.

Whig ideas about sovereignty turned every one of these issues on its head. Ergo this passage taken from an article in *The Westminster Review*: "The wisdom of antiquity is not the wisdom, of gray hairs, but the wisdom of the cradle." This confusing and apparently contradictory passage sums up an argument in which the author establishes an interesting conception of human generations, time, and experience. It is true, says the author, that an old man has more experience and wisdom than a younger man. However, that idea is wrongfully transmitted from individual to generational man. For if one considers all of human history together, each successive generation takes humanity further and further away from any given common origin. Each new generation of youths is, in fact, older than the last generation. Therefore, to argue that old traditions and customs prescribe actions for contemporary man is to argue that the wisdom of babes is better than the wisdom of old men.[50] The prescription of tradition is thus disposed of—if the current generation should wish to change laws or government, then they would have every right to do so since, logically, they have the most wisdom and knowledge about how to constitute such government. Furthermore, the more people brought into the formation of government, the more "wisdom and information" government would have "for the management of its affairs." The more people the better, for the wisdom and experience of one man cannot be better than the wisdom and experience of many men.[51]

An article in *The Edinburgh Review* took great pleasure in showing the example of these principles. Taking up a story coming from British India, the author pointed out that the English government there had taken specific action against a rebellious princeling. The local English officials had "*dethroned* for misgovernment", "*cashiered* for offences…against his subjects",

[50] Anon, "Political Fallacies," *The Westminster Review* 2, no. 4 (1824): 417.
[51] Anon, "Present Policy and Future Fate of Arbitrary Governments," *The Edinburgh Review* 39, no. 78 (1824): 296.

and "*punished* for his abuse of power [emphasis in original]."[52] Later the author asked, "can that be just in the East, which, in Europe, we affect to abhor?" If, in Asia, Englishmen had ostensibly removed a prince from power because of his abuses towards "a trust received," then why not apply the same in Europe? Obviously such actions did not take into account the natural constitution of eastern government— where abuses and cruelties had long been *"immemorial."* Instead such an action emanated from an "enlightened and humane" principle. For the Whigs, government could not be thought of as an immutable formation of the past handed down like an heirloom. Rather it could, and should, be changed and reformulated according to the needs of the contemporary generation. When rulers threatened to violate the trust the people had given them, they ceased to be sovereign. Sovereignty then reverted back to the people who originally gave it, and the people could then form a new government.

For the Tories, sovereignty was something which once given always remained so given. It was a right of the people originally; however, they alienated it at the formation of the original contract.[53] The binding nature of the contract went both ways: the ruler bound to the subject and the subject bound to the ruler. It was true that this contract could be violated. Despite this, never should those violations ever be planned for. That is, changes in government, in the sovereignty of a nation, were always dangerous, and they should always remain an exception rarely even contemplated.[54] For the Whigs, on the other hand, sovereignty was a trust delegated to the sovereign part of a government—be it king or otherwise. Furthermore, the contract of

[52] Referring to the second Kandyan War. Anon, "Cashiering of Kings," *The Edinburgh Review* 26, no. 52 (1816): 439.

[53] For the Tories, the supreme sovereignty could never reside in "the people" no matter if sovereignty might originally stem from the people. See this quote from *The Quarterly Review*: "The idea of sovereignty is inseparable from that of government: the person or persons, who have the supreme command in a political body, are called the sovereign. The proposition asserts, therefore, that supreme command resides essentially in the nation. Anon, "Spain," *The Quarterly Review* 29, no. 57 (1823): 270.

[54] "The Culloden Papers," 155-156.

government could be reformulated at need because "every society has the inalienable right of changing…their governors"[55] Revolutionary danger only came when a ruler denied the basic truth that there was "no authority for any power except the choice of a nation." Put another way, danger only came when a ruler attempted to make alienable what the Whigs saw as inalienable.[56]

If the Whigs saw sovereignty as inalienable from the people and the Tories saw it as alienable from the people, they also viewed the legitimacy of government in much the same way. Legitimacy is a difficult concept to fully define. During this time authors from both parties usually used the term as a descriptive of their government. For example, an author in *The Edinburgh Review* wrote that "the great danger now is from the abuse of legitimate power." Simply put, the context of this passage seems to denote "rightful." However, the same author heaps abuse on those "champions of legitimacy…who hanker after the complete restoration of the old order." In this passage the author uses legitimacy as a derogatory term against those who refuse to allow any reform of government.[57] In much the same way a Tory author writing in *The Quarterly Review* recognizes both a descriptive term—for him synonymous with legality—and a derogatory noun used like the war cry of a savage.[58] For the purposes of this section of the work, it is the defining characteristic of the descriptive, adjectival term legitimacy which is at question. The differences between the Whig and Tory definitions of said term will help in outlining certain key points of divergence between the Whig and Tory Constitution.

For the Whigs, the legitimacy of a government was, much like sovereignty, closely related to the people of the nation. An author writing in *The Westminster Review* cried out

[55] Alvaro Estrada, "Representation to Ferdinand VII in Defence of the Cortes," trans. Charles Toplis, *The Pamphleteer* 14, no. 28 (1819): 362.
[56] Anon, "Reflections on The Conduct of The Allies," *The Pamphleteer* 18 no. 35 (1821): 46.
[57] Anon, "Letters from France," *The Edinburgh Review* 26, no. 51 (1816): 215.
[58] Anon, "Hazlitt's Table Talk." *The Quarterly Review* 26, no. 51 (1822): 106-107.

against what he termed the many sophisms of his age—one of which was the notion of passive-obedience. The idea of general obedience to one's social betters—aristocrats or kings—distracted from the only true question which ought to be asked of any legislation: "is it good or bad" for the general happiness of the people?[59] The legitimacy, or rightfulness, of legislation—therefore of laws—could only come through a consideration of whether they would be good for the greatest number of the populace. In much the same way Alvaro Estrada, writing in *The Pamphleteer*, extended this view of legitimacy to the sovereign as well. "His principal *legitimacy* however ought to consist in promoting the well-being of his people [emphasis in original]."[60] Here the legitimacy of a sovereign stemmed, in essence, from the utility he provided to the people he governed. Furthermore, the people had to be directly participant to the sovereign's legitimacy. Another author in *The Pamphleteer*, Count Toreno, stated quite clearly that "when the legitimacy of a government is generally discussed, it suffices to examine whether this has been acknowledged by the nation, freely and spontaneously, and without any kind of force restraining the manifestation of public dislike."[61] In this article the legitimacy of a government's actions was constituted consensually and given by the people. For the Tories, this was a potentially revolutionary idea. If, as Alvaro Estrada stated, the "established laws" of a nation could only partially form the legitimacy of a government then the laws could be changed, potentially, at will.[62]

The Tories were horrified by these arguments. The people could only exert force and force "gives *power* only" (emphasis in original) it could never "originate rights."[63] Yes, the

[59] "Political Fallacies," 412-414.
[60] Estrada, 362.
[61] José de Llano Count of Toreno, "Count Toreno's Pamphlet &c," trans. William Walton, *The Pamphleteer* 17 no. 33 (1820): 11.
[62] Estrada, 362.
[63] Anon, "Spain," *The Quarterly Review* 29, no. 57 (1823): 271.

people had the power to break laws asunder and to destroy governments, but that did not make their actions legal. Legitimacy for the Tories stemmed further afield. For example, an author in *The British Critic*, when celebrating the enthronement of a new king, wrote in glowing terms of the coronation oath. It was a solemn act, shrouded in mystery, and somehow above all the power of reason and rationality to fully analyze. And this was as it should be, for the ceremony was a "political dedication…to the protection of legitimate authority…a recognition of…rightful power."[64] In many ways the legitimacy of a government simply meant loyalty to long established forms.[65] Thus, when the Whigs spoke of government they spoke of the people's "creation and choice"—that is, a government whose sovereignty they constituted and whose legitimacy they affirmed through choice.[66] The Tories countered by highlighting the importance of law; they made the "cause of legitimate thrones [and] the rights of good governments" analogous things.[67] Government and the English Constitution had, in essence, an in-dwelling authority which could not be legally controverted.[68]

Reverend T.S. Hughes,[69] writing in *The Pamphleteer* against tyranny and despotism, gave another example of how to understand the difference between Whig and Tory legitimacy. He wrote that legitimacy of government was founded on rights found in the people, one of them being the right to resist. Both Whig and Tory authors had much to say about this supposed right

[64] Anon. "Taylor's Glory of Royalty," *The British Critic* 14, (1820): 396.

[65] "Hazlitt's Table Talk," 107. Anon, "Hallam's Constitutional History of England." *The Quarterly Review* 37, no. 73 (1828): 229.

[66] "The Declaration of England against the Acts and Projects of The Holy Alliance," 6.

[67] Anon, "Political Anticipations," *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 28 no. 173 (1830): 736n.

[68] Anon, "State of Parties and the Edinburgh Review." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 3 no. 18 (1818): 716.

[69] Thomas Hughes. (1786-1847). A historian and, for a brief time, a curated Anglican priest, Thomas Hughes traveled to Greece in 1820 and published a travelogue about his journey. In 1822 and 1823 he published two tracts on the Greek Revolution. He is known for his additions to the *History of England* by David Hume. See "Dictionary of National Biographies."

of resistance. The Whig periodicals were always highly favorable. For example, an article in *The Edinburgh Review* pronounced that since "every legitimate government begins by overturning a prior legitimate government," then it could only be that all governments everywhere had to find their foundations in the "assent of the people."[70] Essentially, if legitimacy stemmed from any other source then the consent of the governed, then no government could ever be legitimate because every government began by overthrowing the government which came before it. The same article would later go on to say that despotic tyranny would justify "resistance…to the most ancient dynasty…[and to the] most *legitimate* oppressors" (emphasis in original).[71] Legitimacy, therefore did not come from strength of claim but rather from the consent of the people. Another article in *The Edinburgh Review* clearly stated that the "sacred principle of Resistance" was the most important right of Englishmen everywhere. Remove it and tyranny and corruption would have nothing to fear, and this would inevitably result in the total degradation of the English state. Or, as William Peter in *The Pamphleteer* put it, "The most valuable privilege of a free people is the right of investigating and exposing the measures of their Rulers."[72] It was not only the right, it was the duty of all the populace to vigorously watch the actions of their government and make sure said actions were always in line with the happiness of the nation. The legitimacy of the government therefore had to do with the happiness of the governed, and this was a happiness constantly checked by the right of resistance. Any government which failed to meet the standard failed to keep its legitimacy in the only court which mattered—the popular.[73]

The Tory press, however, saw legitimacy as a legal establishment. Laws could not be broken merely because the governed body did not like them. If that were established as a

[70] Anon, "Buonaparte and the Elba MS.," *The Edinburgh Review* 30, no. 40 (1818): 447.
[71] Ibid., 449.
[72] Peter, 216-217.
[73] Ibid., 216-217.

principal, then there could be no government at all. A right to resistance could only be exercised according to the wisdom of any given moment, and this could never be anything more than a shifting, ill-defined abstraction which moved with the whims of different men and according to different seasons. "No government can please and gratify all those who are subject to it."[74] Furthermore, resistance to "tyranny," if established as a principle, could only result in a myriad of justifications to overthrow government. What might be tyrannical to one man could be just to another, and who was to say which man was right and wrong? Additionally, if a right of resistance did exist, then what it truly amounted to was an utterly improper distinction between civil obedience and political duty. How could it be the duty of a citizen to contemplate overthrowing or resisting his government without at the same time necessitating a disorderly, dangerous—*revolutionary* if you will—disobedience?[75] At the core of any "right of resistance" was a revolutionary idea meant to destroy all laws and the very foundations of all government because such an idea created a populace separated from any responsibility to their ruler. And "if the subject be not bound, how can the ruler be?"[76] The legitimacy of a government, therefore, had to come from something more than the consent of the governed. The Tories constituted legitimacy in much the same way that they constituted sovereignty. Just as sovereignty, once given, could not be taken back, legitimacy, once established in a corpus of law and practice, could not be destroyed by the whims of one generation. Whig notions of consensual legitimacy and inalienable sovereignty were abhorrent and revolutionary. Furthermore, how could both of these ideas be in line with Christianity? How could the right of resistance and consensual legitimacy truly be in accordance with Christian notions of humility and charity? How could the

[74] "The Culloden Papers." 156.
[75] Anon, "Remarks on the Principles of the Eclectic Review," *The British Critic* 9, (1818): 201-202.
[76] "Letter on the Spirit of the Age," 901.

"keen and scrutinizing eye" constantly watching the acts of a given government not controvert Christian doctrine which called for simple obedience—to render to Caesar?[77]

If, as has been demonstrated, English Constitutional rhetoric about sovereignty and legitimacy in the years after the French Revolution was still similar to the debate between Burke and Price, then one cannot discount the importance of the place each party gave to Christianity in their constitutional interpretation. Both the rhetorical environment about the Constitution into which Greece entered and the utility of Greece within English debate hinged greatly on Christianity. Therefore, perhaps the all-important difference between Whig and Tory arguments and their two interpretations of the constitution can perhaps be found in their variant views of Christianity—in both its inherent structure and in the place they gave it vis-à-vis the government. The Tories viewed Christianity, specifically Anglican Christianity, as an inherent part of the English Constitution. The government was partially there to literally defend a state Christianity, and it was not an Erastian relationship wherein the Church was wholly a function of the state.[78] Rather the relationship was more symbiotic in nature. Nevertheless, Tory Christianity did place a great deal of emphasis on obedience to authority and contentment within a hierarchical state structure. Whig Christianity was very different. It would be a terrible misnomer to say that Whigs, as a whole, did not conceptualize Christianity as a very important part of being English. Whigs, on the whole, thought of themselves as Christian—or at least described their views on government and society as Christian. There is no reason not to take the Whigs at face value; on the contrary, it is important to recognize the validity of their claim. Whig Christianity did not

[77] "Remarks on the Principles of the Eclectic Review," 200.

[78] Erastianism, the philosophy that the state is supreme in Church matters. This is a misleading interpretation of the actual views of Thomas Erastus. For more on the political and religious philosophies of Thomas Erastus, see Charles Gunnoe, *Thomas Erastus and the Palatinate: A Renaissance Physician in the Second Reformation* (Leiden: Brill, 2010).

make room for any claims of Anglican exclusivity or hegemony over official doctrine. Sometimes this view went as far as positing a necessary separation between Church and State as the only way to overcome a terrible tyranny of priestcraft. It is certain that, on the whole, the Whigs felt that Christianity ought to be more a personal relationship between man and God, that any person or organization that got in the way of this was dangerous, and that there ought to be more freedom of choice in religious matters. Simply put, Whig Christianity was more egalitarian, and it was more likely to be constituted in a sphere separate from that of the government.

Both Whig and Tory periodicals betrayed these views through several themes of discussion. Often the structure and form of Christianity, as a religion connected to or separate from the state, came under open discussion. Additionally, both parties related their views concerning the nature of man directly to the type of government which ought to rule over him. Finally, the "true" notion of liberty or freedom—truth according to each party—also exemplifies certain similarities and dissimilarities between Whig and Tory Christianity. Painting this picture of the divergences between Tory and Whig beliefs about Sovereignty, Legitimacy, and Christianity will then allow for a more synthetic understanding of the Tory and Whig interpretation of the English Constitution.

An article in *The British Critic* avowed that the principles of the Church of England were fundamentally non-violent and that they included a prescription against any "resistance to authority." True followers were unquestionably required to be loyal at all times.[79] The connection between true religion and loyalty is further shown in another article found in *The Maga*. "Moral purity" of a right ought to always be bonded to fidelity, allegiance, and love of country. This bond had always provided the "highest attribute in the national character of our

[79] "Kenny's Principles &c of Pretended Reformers," 51.

countrymen." Without it, England would lose that very thing which made her great.[80] A later article associated much the same things: "the cause of order, liberty, and religion" was something in dire need of a champion. Respect for the king and government went hand in hand with respect for God. All the true principles of civil government were directly related the Christian religion: honor the country and give glory to God.[81] For these Tory authors, loyalty and Christianity were in a one to one relationship where the decline of one would lead to a decline of the other.[82] Furthermore, the government was constituted with a king who had a right to ask for allegiance, and Christianity invariably made it a duty for the subject to give it.

For the Whigs, this conception of Christianity smacked of corruption and tyranny; it was a "pretext" of holding up "loyalty" through a "sort of religious veneration for all establishment." In reality these ideas did nothing more than make slaves of all men by inducing them to "worship despotism."[83] How could it be that God would require obedience to unjust laws and practices? Would that not, in turn, make God himself unjust? That idea was, of course, blasphemous. God was just; He wanted men to be happy, and He could not be displeased with any act of man which would call into account a tyranny.[84] The implication that good Christian men had the right to call their government into account when it failed to live up to true Christianity meant that God did not underwrite government. Rather government was a human institution meant to be corrected and changed according to human needs. Whatever the duties of Christian ministry might be, they appertained to the "*conscience*" which was something entirely separate from "*civil*" affairs.[85] Or,

[80] Anon, "Late Sins of the Public Prints," *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 4, no. 21 (1819): 356.
[81] Anon, "The Warder," *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 6, no. 32 (1820): 212.
[82] Anon, [Robert Southey] "Parliamentary Reform," *The Quarterly Review* 16, no. 31 (1817): 227. (See *The Quarterly Review under Gifford*, page 54).
[83] Anon, "High Tory Principles," *The Edinburgh Review* 41, no. 81 (1825): 1-2.
[84] "Political Fallacies," 421-422.
[85] George Dyer, "Four Letter on The English Constitution," *The Pamphleteer* 12, no. 24 (1818): 432. Geroge Dyer (1755-1841) was a long-lived, prolific advocate of Parliamentary Reform. He was a supporter of the

put in another way, only the practical actions of men were the just domain of a government—what a man believed was something which ought to be separate. "Religious worship is the offering of a grateful heart to its benefactor. Who but the DIVINE OBJECT of the tribute, shall appreciate its value?"[86]

Aside from the official form of Christianity in England, Whig and Tory authors butted heads over the nature of man. For the Tories, human institutions would always be subject to faults and problems. The truth of this was blatantly obvious and any attempt to reform institutions and make them better held at its core a false premise that institutions could ever be improved through the efforts of man.[87] Human beings were naturally corrupt.[88] History and philosophy showed this.[89] Government was meant to be the "art…of managing mankind unable to manage themselves."[90] Laws were meant to be those things which stood in-the-stead-of the judgment of a moment, and anything or anyone who told man that he was "wiser and better than [he] truly [is]" was a "plague."[91] These ideas about the nature of man inevitably affected the Tory view of government and stemmed from an interpretation of Christianity which placed emphasis on inner sin, weakness, and frailty. Government and law were those institutions meant to counter these failings. They were able to do this through their prescriptive nature and God's providence. It is almost as if government and law were refined entities—metal re-forged, tested and tried by time, from which the dross had been, as much as possible, removed.

French Revolution and came up with several plans for the improvement of the nation during the initial years of the Revolution. He was friends with Thomas Coleridge and Charles Lamb. See "Dictionary of National Biographies."

[86] Peter, 256.

[87] "Kenny's Principles &c of Pretended Reformers," 41.

[88] "State of Parties and the Edinburgh Review," 722.

[89] Anon, "The Faction," *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 22 no. 81 (1827): 409.

[90] John Cocks Lord Somers, "Lord Somers' Defence," *The Pamphleteer* 10, no. 20 (1817): 332.

[91] [Richard Chenevix], "England and France," 540-541.

Whigs, on the other hand, built their understanding of the nature of man from a different stream of Christianity. For example, an article in the Pamphleteer by Mr. George Dyer hailed the "primitive reason of man"—inherent in every man—as something not only worthy of admiration, not only to be relied upon, but as something actually comparable to Christ's redemptive power. God empowered man, through his reason, to ascertain correct actions and to make choices accordingly. True, "base interests and passions…prejudices and superstitions" could get in the way of that reason. Eventually, however, man would improve his lot.[92] Not all Whig authors would have gone so far as Mr. Dyer. It is certainly true, however, that they viewed Tory pessimism as an excuse to keep government corrupt and evil men in charge. Instead of giving up gloomily, would it not be better to try? to actively oppose man's nature with the help of God?[93] Refuting the Tory idea that such an attempt would be quixotic, Whig Christianity made room for human improvement. Humanity progressed in an upward spiral—instead of revolving in a circle—and this would eventually result in a "sure consummation of glory."[94] By emphasizing human agency in the improvement of the soul, the Whigs also emphasized human responsibility for improving government. Man could act instead of waiting patiently for God's providence. This did not discount God's providential acts; rather, it argued that God acted in various other ways. Forms of Christianity which emphasized the sinfulness of man in reality were only sophisms meant to keep one faction in power through the "joint domination of

[92] "Lord Somers' Defence," 352.
[93] "Political Fallacies," 410.
[94] Thomas Hughes, "Considerations on the Greek Revolution," *The Pamphleteer* 22, no. 43 (1823): 201. "Present Policy and Future Fate of Arbitrary Governments," 285.

priestcraft and kingcraft."[95] Liberty was what Christianity was truly about—after all, would not the truth set you free?[96]

An author writing in *The Edinburgh Review* proclaimed that "the cause of liberty…is at present what Protestantism was 200 years ago; for liberty is the heresy of our age."[97] Whig conceptions of liberty were connected to Whig ideas about true Christianity. Much as there had been a tyrannical conspiracy against true Christian doctrine in the days of the Reformation, there was currently a despotic confederation arrayed against the liberties of mankind. Nevertheless, just as Protestantism had overcome adversity, so too would liberty overcome the forces of false religion fighting against it—false religion led by men, who like "the monks of the dark ages," called rebellion against their unjust rule a sin and branded all virtue a crime.[98] The "divine spirit of freedom" would inevitably overcome those false men who sought to use Christianity to hold all government unchangeable and who called all innovation terrible.[99] "Liberty [would] be ultimately triumphant" against the enemies of reform because it was indestructible.[100] Besides making claims about the immutability of liberty which Tory authors found extremely distasteful, Whig authors often cast false Christians together with enemies of freedom. Whig Christianity would not have peoples and nations held down by casuistic ministers of state acting the Jesuit—men who used religion profanely to "impose on some and disgust others."[101]

[95] "High Tory Principles," 2.
[96] Interpretation of John 8:32.
[97] Anon, "Alien Law of England," *The Edinburgh Review* 42, no. 83 (1825): 170.
[98] "Alien Law of England," 171-172.
[99] Anon, "Sign of the Times," *The Edinburgh Review* 49, no. 98 (1829): 448.
[100] Anon, "Dispositions of England and America," *The Edinburgh Review* 33, no. 66 (1820): 403. Anon, "Prospects of the Holy Alliance—Stability of the French Government," *The Edinburgh Review* 40, no. 80 (1824): 521.
[101] Anon, "Men and Things in 1823," *The Westminster Review* 1, no. 1 (1824): 13-14.

Tory authors, on the other hand, were often suspicious of liberty. This is not to say that they actively wrote against liberty. On the contrary, as an article in *The Quarterly Review* explained, the "practice" of liberty was something to be admired. It was only when the abstract principle of liberty became a basis for action that it became dangerous.[102] Liberty had to be "regulated" by the Constitution.[103] Otherwise liberty would go too far and turn to the destruction of "public morals" (which in turn would destroy all legitimate liberty as well).[104] Freedom was a goal achievable only through a vigorous defense of virtue and education.[105] In essence, if liberty did not further the goals of good government—the promotion of religion, virtue, and happiness"—then it was useless as anything other than a "cloak for licentiousness."[106] For the Tories, liberty was not a tool used for improving morality or virtue; rather, it was a reward of good morality, good government, and good laws. Handing it out willy-nilly was dangerous. For the Tories, false Christians used "liberty" to smear and vituperate the rightful government and church.

Whig Christianity, therefore, focused on God working inside man while the Tory idea of Christianity showed God working through laws and institutions (i.e., things outside of man) to ensure man's happiness. Tories, of necessity, saw existing laws and government as something meant by God to protect man from the worst parts of himself. Contrary to this, Whig Christians felt that God gave man inner reason and, with varying degrees of help, allowed man to use said reason to improve his lot as he saw fit. Tory Christianity constituted an established Church as a foundational part of the English government and English Constitution. This, in essence, made

[102] [Richard Chenevix], "England and France," 540.
[103] Anon, "Spain," *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 14, no. 83 (1823): 690.
[104] Anon, "South America," *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 15, no. 85 (1824): 137.
[105] Anon, "The Liberal System," *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 16, no. 93 (1824): 444.
[106] "Lord Somers' Defence," 342.

God a notary witness to the current state system. Tories called on every Englishman to remember "how he was taught to bless God and honour [sic] the King."[107] Whig Christianity remained outside of the official forms of government on one level, but in another it was more deeply connected. For if God made in man a rational being capable of improving himself and his own government, then surely any government man chose would be the government God wanted him to have. And therein lay the egalitarian nature of Whig Christianity—for every man was capable of self-improvement and every man had the right to participate in judging his government according to the truth which God put in his heart.

As is apparent by this point, Whig and Tory sovereignty, legitimacy, and Christianity were very different, and, as might be thought, they formed part of two very different interpretations of the English Constitution. Each claimed to be the sole interpretation—the only right way to look at the entire corpus of English law, tradition, practice, and at the legacy of 1688. Additionally, each party claimed that the other side's interpretation spelt doom for everyone and everything. Both parties built a crises out of the other party's beliefs.

For example, in an article in *The Quarterly*, the unknown author wrote that the English Constitution was "not a creature of theory…not…a garment which we can deliver over to the tailors to cut and slash at pleasure." Rather it was "the skin of the body politic." Therefore, at its heart was no one single idea but instead the Constitution was literally the skin of the nation which had grown as the nation had grown.[108] The English Constitution was the best in "Christendom," and any attempt to change it, as the Whigs were so doing, would be an insane act tantamount to a man tearing down the best building in the land to start anew.[109] If the Whig

[107] "The Warder," 211.
[108] [Robert Southey] "Parliamentary Reform," 253.
[109] "Lord Somers' Defence" 352.

views of government were true then, said an author writing in *The Maga*, "our constitutional creed is a false one…[and] ought to be abolished."[110] The Whigs took things too far towards the power of the people; the uniqueness and value of the English Constitution came from the perfect balance of monarchy and freedom.[111] The Constitution could be perverted if it was not protected and guarded—after all it was only an "inert instrument."[112] And this protection was a great preoccupation of the Tory press because "the present 'Whigs'…[having] forfeited the confidence of the country by a long course of action the memory of which can never be obliterated," had betrayed their once noble principles to the "irreconcilable" system of the French Revolution. "Mr. Burke, on the…occasion of his separation from Mr. Fox…must have felt also, that the cause of order and genuine liberty must have sustained an irreparable misfortune in the defection of a man who was born to sway inferior understandings, and who could not revolt against the legitimate authority of the Constitution, without spreading the flame of insurrection through a large portion of society."[113] Here the true Whig and the true Whig constitution were betrayed by Mr. Fox and his followers who insisted on associating the events of 1688 with those of 1789. Order and genuine liberty (a necessary distinction) had nothing to do with 1789 and the French Revolution—and of necessity 1688, the crowning of William and Mary, the Bill of Rights, and the laws of England also had nothing to do with 1789. This view of England, the "true" Whig, Tory view of England—Burke's England—interpreted the English Constitution as a body with a Sovereignty alienated from the people, a Legitimacy established by law and prescription, and a Christianity underwriting a hierarchical society.

[110] "The Liberal System," 454.
[111] "Spain," 690.
[112] "South America," 135.
[113] State of the Parties and the Edinburgh Review, 716.

Alternatively, the Whigs felt rather strongly that the current government of the country did not represent the true Constitution correctly. There was too much power in the hands of the rulers.[114] The changes had been small and incremental; however, that did not mean the danger was not extreme.[115] The Tory government had actively countenanced and supported these changes, some of which undoubtedly represented a "manifest impeachment not only of the Revolution of 1688, but of the fundamental principles and daily practice of the…Constitution."[116] For this reason, the Constitution needed to be saved by a restoration of its original purity. Reform of the electoral system would address the balance of power away from the rulers. Reform of the Church would ensure that churchmen would never unjustly interfere with the management of governmental affairs.[117] Only through actions such as these could England maintain the rightful reputation of freedom and happiness she had acquired so long ago in Magna Carta—a constitution whose end was to protect liberty, just as Price, Burke's ideological opponent, had claimed.[118]

Both interpretations of the English Constitution had existed since the advent of 1688 and even before. Burke's constitution—which by 1815 was the Tory constitution—had long been the dominant interpretation. It was the French Revolution, especially the conflict over why the war had been fought which both reignited and recrystallized the debate. Other continental issues fueled the rhetorical divide. When the Greek Revolution erupted in 1821, it exerted an influence on both interpretations so that the Whig view of the Constitution as a contractual corpus comprised of an inalienable sovereignty, a consensual legitimacy, and an egalitarian Christianity

[114] Anon, "Liberty of the Press and its Abuses," *The Edinburgh Review* 27, no. 53 (1816): 120.
[115] Anon, "Dangers of the Constitution," *The Edinburgh Review* 27, no. 53 (1816): 245.
[116] "*The Holy Alliance* verses *Spain*," 261.
[117] Anon, "State of the Country," *The Edinburgh Review* 32, no. 64 (1819): 297. Dyer, 431.
[118] "Alien Law of England," 100. Peter, 246.

apart from the government was given an advantage. However, it is not enough to argue that the Greek Revolution helped to shift the English Constitution from a providential to a contractual basis, without explaining how it was that it was enabled to do so. For if both of these interpretations had long existed, why was it at this particular time that the Whigs were able to affect a shift when before they had not? The answer to this question begins in the legacy of the French Revolution and traces itself across a variety of domestic and foreign issues and events as both parties increasingly sought to destroy each other through successful association of the enemy with either tyrannical oppression or revolutionary fervor. The Whigs eagerly associated their Tory adversaries with the killers of Christ, while the Tories proclaimed loudly that "the Whig of 1688 [had] degenerated into the Jacobin of 1822."[119] The growth of an environment of rhetorical hatred made it possible for the Greek Revolution to influence domestic English interpretation about the correct interpretation of their constitution. The next chapter will outline the heightened rhetorical atmosphere into which the Greek Revolution entered. Both parties sought to use continental events to further their own constitutional interpretation. The Greek Revolution, because of long held philhellenic ideals, became one of the most important Whig tools.

[119] "High Tory Principles," 14n. Anon, "The Congress," *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 12, no. 70 (1822): 652.

CHAPTER TWO: TO WRITE THE SONGS OF A NATION

Andrew Fletcher is quoted as saying, "if a man were permitted to make all the ballads [of a nation] he need not care who should make the laws."[120] Fletcher spoke decades before the end of the French Revolution, yet his sentiment is representative of a conflict about which both the Whig and Tory presses felt most strongly. Both felt that the other side was unfairly using invective and purposefully misrepresenting the truth. An author in *The Maga* bemoaned that what the Whigs supported was always "'liberal and enlightened,' and what it attacked was always bigoted and antiquated.'"[121] Alternatively, *The Edinburgh Review* felt that the Tory authors used "cant" and "flattery" to sooth and calm its readers into a coma whilst at the same time slowly picking away at the true freedom and privileges which were the English birthright.[122] In this rhetorical conflict the laws of England did not matter as much as the actual interpretation of those laws, and both sides felt that the press had the most important impact upon those interpretations.[123]

How did this conflict come about? As has been shown, although the Tory and Whig interpretations of the Constitution in 1815 were very different, they were closely related, if not largely the same, as the two interpretations held about 1688 since the advent of that most Glorious revolution. The reasons matters came to an impasse was heavily influenced by—if not entirely a result of—the French Revolution. As J.C.D. Clark put it, the question of whether

[120] Andrew Fletcher, *The Political Works of Andrew Fletcher* (London: James Bettenham, 1737), 372.
[121] "The Faction," 412.
[122] Anon, "Foreign Policy of England," *The Edinburgh Review* 28, no. 55 (1817): 114.
[123] "Liberty of the Press and its Abuses," 103, 129. "Taylor's Glory of Royalty," 395. "Burgess's Reflections on the Spirit of the Times," 551.

"1688 had constituted a violation of legitimacy fully comparable to that of 1789" was an important, perhaps a defining, question of the time—both before the actual commencement of the war between England and France, as seen in Burke and Price, and after the end of the war.[124] If the answer were yes, that is, that 1688 and 1789 had been essentially similar actions taken rightfully against a tyrannical king—as the Whigs argued—then the question as to why England had called actions taken in 1688 good and actions taken in 1789 bad became especially pressing. Contrariwise, if the answer were no, that 1688 and 1789 had been in their essence dissimilar, as the Tories argued, then the conclusion following would be that the war had been fought against bad revolutionary principles and not against tyranny.

Because the Whigs felt that 1688 and 1789 were the same, for the most part, they also felt that England had fought the war against Napoleon's despotism and tyranny—and most importantly, that the war had introduced legal and social precedents dangerous to the English Constitution. There would need to be a restoration to original purity—the Constitution needed saving. In order to prove this, the Whig party and its press set out to demonstrate that the Tories and their conception of the sovereignty, legitimacy, and Christianity framing the English Constitution was the same tyrannical conception which all true Englishmen had supposedly cast off in 1688. Sometimes they directed their attack against only one part of the Tory interpretation, and sometimes they attacked two or more.

The Tories, on the other hand, felt that because 1688 and 1789 were entirely different acts, the war had been fought against the terrible ideas which inspired the French to murder their Royal family and set out on a war of international conquest. Napoleon was the most inspired scion of the Revolution, not a separate entity who had expropriated it for bad ends. Therefore,

[124] Clark, *Reflections on Revolution in France*, 43.

England had fought the war to protect itself and others from destructive ideas. The Constitution had been protected and preserved in its original purity. It followed that anyone who believed otherwise was at best deceived and at worst out to deceive others for their own ends. The Constitution needed protecting from such men, and the best way to do so was to prove that such men were propagating the same revolutionary ideas which had undone France and might have undone England without constant vigilance. Most importantly, the interpretation of sovereignty, legitimacy, and Christianity these men held, in the understanding of the Tory press, would inevitably end with destruction and ruin.

With the legacy of the French Revolution as a starting point, both parties fixed the lines for a political conflict over the body of the English Constitution. The balance of the constitution's dominant interpretation in part depended on the rhetorical abilities of each respective party to prove that its understanding of sovereignty, legitimacy, and Christianity, that is, that its viewpoint was the true heir to 1688. The members of these parties set out to substantiate this through the use of various domestic and foreign affairs, both defending themselves and attacking the other party—and their interpretation—in various ways. The Whigs associated their opponents with tyrannical abuses, very similar to the abuses of 1688 which supposedly inspired that revolution. The Tories countered by associating their opponents with the sins of the French Jacobins—those atheists and anarchists who only wanted to see the world burn. Each side was able to maintain a relative rhetorical parity, that is, each side was able to successfully cast the other as either tyrants attempting to emulate James II or enthusiasts attempting to emulate the Jacobins.

There were several issues, both at home and abroad, which gave both sides the fodder for their respective rhetoric. In this work an analysis of a small selection of these issues can best

illustrate both the rhetorical conflict and the relative parity between the two parties and their respective interpretations. The Congress of Vienna and the Bourbon Restoration in France; the proper place and use of the Press; and the actions of the Holy Alliance vis-à-vis revolutionary upheaval in Spain and Naples were all issues and events through which this work will show how both parties sought to establish dominance over the other. All of these issues stemmed from the continent first, and they became influential because both parties sought to use them as rhetorical fodder to further their own ends. It was only the growth of this rhetorical conflict at home which enabled the Greek Revolution to have an effect upon the interpretation of the English Constitution because it upset the relative rhetorical parity between the two parties and their respective interpretations. Chapter two of this work will therefore first show the two different interpretations of the French Revolution; it will show how each of these was in turn tied into a core idea concerning the Constitution (that is, it either needed to be saved or protected); and further, how each party then attempted to use several other continental issues to frame their view of correct constitutional interpretation. Only after these steps are accomplished will it be possible to make an argument about the importance of the Greek Revolution as an event which turned to the advantage of one party and viewpoint and the disadvantage of the other party and their viewpoint.

The Tories and the Whigs each had contrasting ideas about why England had gone to war against France. An author in *The Edinburgh Review* reviewed and analyzed a French work whose own author claimed that the French Revolution had been "no conflict of parties…for power or for territory, but [rather] an insurrection of the whole nation against the unjust and oppressive privileges of a few." Furthermore, this French author proclaimed that because kings were meant to be for the people, the restoration of the Bourbon monarchy proved that foreign

tyranny had forced something on France which it did not want.[125] The anonymous author in *The Edinburgh Review* thought perhaps the Frenchman went too far but that some of his ideas were "sound enough." Later he made some of his own positive statements on the matter. He declared that England and others had rightfully dethroned Bonaparte because of his attempts at worldwide conquest and universal tyranny. Yet he had not been the only "bad neighbor;" there were other sovereigns who were "eager to follow his example."[126] Furthermore, Bonaparte had been noticeably better at ruling than some of the "allies" of England.[127] Another Whig author stated that the Revolution had produced many good things: it had done away with the tyranny of the Catholic Church; it had given the French nation at large a voice in writing its own laws; and it had made French society far more based on merit. These were unquestionably good things.[128] Although there had been many bad things in the French Revolution, these Whig authors emphasized that not everything it had produced ought to be destroyed.

For another author writing in *The Edinburgh Review*, England had "sown over Europe, with our own hand, the seeds of freedom; [she had] spoken of it always as [her] common cause; in heading every resistance to Buonaparte. [sic]" The result of all of this, however, was an even worse tyranny on the continent of Europe. Life there had been reduced to "little more than a worthless struggle for a change of masters."[129] England had done the right thing in resisting Napoleon, but, after the war, she had immediately forgotten what she had been about. The Tories and their continental allies, said another author, now claimed that Bonaparte had come "from the Revolution," but in reality their "enmity to him increased with his distance from a revolutionary

[125] "Buonaparte and the Elba MS.," 447, 450.
[126] Ibid., 452.
[127] Ibid., 453.
[128] Anon, "France," *The Edinburgh Review 25*, no. 50 (1815): 505-506.
[129] "Alien Law of England," 172-173.

origin;" their hatred of him culminated when he "had become as regular an Imperial despot" as any other of the continental monarchies. The implication of this argument was that England, in having fought for freedom against Napoleon's tyranny, had been fighting against a tyranny very similar to that which currently defined the monarchies of the continent. The same threat which Bonaparte had represented was still active in European politics and if England did not watch closely, then she would have '"no reason to congratulate [herself] upon…[escaping] either from the French Revolution or from Buonaparte [sic]."'[130] England had, in the words of an anonymous tract in *The Pamphleteer*, surrendered everything and sacrificed much to ensure a victory against France in spite of unreliable allies and many defeats. In spite of this, the nation's reward had been a betrayal of the Constitution by the ministerial government which sought to extend and enforce measures taken illegally during the war. Liberty and the Constitution had been betrayed.[131]

Tory authors, on the other hand, felt that there had been nothing good to come out of the French Revolution. An anonymous author writing in *The Pamphleteer* wrote that all the terrible things which came out of the French Revolution stemmed from a "substitution of imaginary for known duties." The proper body for the reform of an admittedly corrupt state, the ancient legislature, had been suborned by the mobs of Paris—"at once representative and people, subject, sovereign, accuser and judge." Chaos resulted and everything culminated in a truth, namely, that visionary reform (like the French Revolution) ended always in militaristic tyranny (like Napoleon).[132] Another article, published in *The Maga*, also connected Bonaparte and his despotism with the "foul principles which had engendered" them. These principles had

[130] Anon, "Naples," *The Edinburgh Review* 35, no. 69 (1821): 83, 88.
[131] "The Declaration of England against the Acts and Projects of The Holy Alliance," 2-3.
[132] Anon, "Episcopacy Considered with a Reference to Modern Popular Societies," *The Pamphleteer* 16, no. 32 (1820): 431-432.

controverted all faith, all governments, and all the forces of order throughout Europe. The conclusion was that "a government founded in the revolutionary principles on which that of Buonaparte [sic] stood, could only be a curse to the world."[133] Bonaparte and the French revolution were one and the same thing to the Tories and the Tory press; the beginning of the war had been fought against the Revolution, and it had been carried through to its conclusions against the Revolution's scion.[134]

England had then, for two decades, waged a just war against revolutionary ideals. These ideas, propagated by evil men and soulless mobs, had sought to destroy everything good throughout Europe. England had won the war, and in so doing had saved her own government and the governments of others. Because governments, in the Tory view, had much to do with order, peace, and prosperity, then together these were the things which England had truly saved. Unfortunately, there was currently, that is in the years after the end of the war, a cabal of "Ultra-Whigs and Extra-Reformers" who had once worshipped that "Perfect Emperor" of France and who were now engaged in spreading his ideas.[135] Because of the profligacy of these fools, only with a great deal of hard work could England prove to others that "English liberty is not the forerunner of revolution."[136] For the most part, Tory authors of the press evinced views which argued strongly that England had fought against revolutionary disorder, that Bonaparte had been the best son of that revolution, and that English liberty was fundamentally different than the poor ersatz the French had created. The continual claims of the Whig opposition that England had fought against tyranny for liberty—that is, against Napoleon and not the principles of 1789—

[133] Anon, "The State of Europe and The Holy Alliance," *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 15, no. 86 (1824): 319.
[134] [Robert Southey], "Parliamentary Reform," 227-228.
[135] Ibid., 238, 241.
[136] Anon, "Memoirs of Europe," *The British Critic* 23, (1825): 116.

represented the same threat to the English Constitution which had supposedly gone into a final defeat in 1815. The Constitution still needed protecting.

"Are we then actually in danger of rebellion and revolution?" asked an author in *The Quarterly Review*. He gave the answer to the question in the form of a long anecdotal story purportedly taken from a sermon preached before Edward VI. The port in the town of Sandwich in Kent had been blocked by a shifting bank of sand, called the Goodwin Sands. This bank, still a prominent navigational hazard off the coast of Dover, had been disrupting trade, and a commission was sent to discover the reason it had appeared. After calling all the wise men of the area before him, the commissioner, Master More, asked them what might be the cause of this problem. The eldest of them answered that the Tenterton Steeple has caused the Goodwin sands. When asked to further elucidate this statement, the man answered and said that he remembered a time when the church steeple had not been built. No sands had ever blocked the port of Sandwich then. It was only after the building of the church that the sands had come, and therefore Tenterton Steeple had caused the Goodwin Sands. In essence, *The Quarterly* published the entire story as an accusation against the Whigs who were making correlation into causation. They attempted to make the natural stresses which the end of a war economy would bring to any state into a flash and dance number meant to prove that defects of the Constitution were the cause of the problems and that fixing the Constitution could fix the problem.[137] The Whigs used every possible means to convince the population that they were being cheated and unfairly repressed in order to turn true Englishmen who supported the Constitution into '"objects of hatred and contempt."'[138] Fortunately, there was no real danger as long as good and true Englishmen took seriously the low and vulgar devices the Whigs were using to debase the ignorant masses.

[137] [Robert Southey], "Parliamentary Reform," 251-252.
[138] "Kenny's Principles &c of Pretended Reformers," 165.

Before, England had been saved by loyal associations against the French machinations, and she could so be saved by similar measures now.[139] Tories felt that there was a threat to the Constitution "consist[ing] in the existence of a spirit which is essentially at variance with every part of the old spirit of our country", and that the "danger is great, [only] if England be false to her ancient character."[140] Men were needed to step up and protect true Englishness and the true English Constitution.

The Whig press, on the other hand, felt that the laws of England after the end of the war were too gracious in the powers they gave to the rulers and not open-handed towards the people.[141] There were men in the government who, denying that liberty was the sole raison d'être of the Constitution, sought to pervert the natural English birthright.

> There can be no doubt that the effect of their doctrines being generally received, if it is not the very object they have in view, would be to destroy the fundamental principles of the English constitution, it is fit that the people should, from time to time, be put on their guard against such wiles; and warned against suffering themselves gradually to adopt the language of despotic governments, and to substitute the feelings of servile flatterers, abjectly cringing before an arbitrary master, for the manly attachment to their country and its institutions, which becomes the citizens of a free state.[142]

The Tory party had used the French war as an excuse to change certain laws, and they had begun to sneak in principles and ideas which rightfully belonged to a past long ago relegated to quaint barbarity. These were the principles of *jus divinum* and of the tyrant, James II. The glorious

[139] Ibid., 166-167.
[140] "The Warder," 206.
[141] "Liberty of the Press and its Abuses," 103, 139.
[142] "High Tory Principles," 41, 1-2.

Constitution which had deposed that "miserable" monarch was partially lost, and it needed to be saved.[143]

The core contentions of both parties, therefore, revolved around the English Constitution. Each party felt that there was a real danger posed to the "true" Constitution. Each felt that the other party was out to destroy and pervert English government—surely the most pure and best that had ever graced the face of the earth. This, at least, the Whig and Tory presses could agree on. There was little room for any other common ground however. Instead both presses engaged in a war of words. Each attempted to prove their enemies were the inveterate foes of the English Constitution and that their views of sovereignty, legitimacy, and Christianity would either ruin England with Jacobite tyrannies or Jacobin licentiousness. Whigs attacked Tory constitutional interpretation through several issues in the press more or less germane to their goals. For example, the Whigs used the Congress of Vienna and the peace which it eventually established—including the Bourbon restoration—in an attempt to prove the Tories meant to embroil the nation in a constitutional crisis. International actions muzzling the press abroad and at home next outraged the Whigs. Finally, the Holy Alliance and their suppression of at least two notable rebellions in Spain and Naples gave the Whigs ammunition to use against the Tories and the ministry. Each time the Tory press countered Whig arguments, more or less successfully, and defended both the actions taken at home and abroad as necessary preventatives against the spread of the French contagion which had threatened the world for a quarter-century. As will be shown, throughout this process argument became increasingly polarized and particularly vicious. By the outbreak of the Greek Revolution, the coherence of each interpretation of the Constitution often relied not on the internal logic of each position but rather upon the external amount of excrement

[143] "*Béranger's* Song," 198.

it was possible to lay at the feet of the enemy party and the enemy interpretation. The heightened atmosphere of rhetorical conflict made it possible for the Greek Revolution of 1821 to have an effect on the dominant interpretation of the English Constitution.

When the war with Napoleon first ended in 1814, the first Peace of Paris officially ended hostilities with an exhausted France. Signed on 30 May 1814, the treaty, among many other things, called for all the nations to send plenipotentiaries to Vienna to discuss a European wide settlement of peoples, nations, and trade.[144] What is important, vis-à-vis the conflict between Whigs and Tories in England, is the system of territorial compensation put into place and the restoration of the Bourbon dynasty to the throne of France.[145] In brief, the Congress of Vienna compensated Russia with lands in Poland which had been seized during the French Revolution

[144] Mark Jarrett, *The Congress of Vienna and its Legacy: War and Great Power Diplomacy after Napoleon* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2014), 65.

[145] This meeting became known as the Congress of Vienna. The five great powers, England, Austria, Russia, Prussia, and France, were represented by Robert Stewart, the Lord Castlereagh, Clemens von Metternich, Tsar Alexander I, Karl von Hardenburg, and Charles de Talleyrand respectively. These men negotiated the great settlement of European nations which is often considered to have lasted peacefully for almost 100 years. Innumerable historians have written inordinate amounts of literature about the Congress of Vienna—especially after the great failure of the next treaty to end a general European war. Territorial compensation is a huge topic which is depressingly complex. To get across a sense, in brief, of some of the actions which outraged the Whigs in England, one can analyze the Saxon-Polish issue. Poland, in the 17th century a massive monarchical state stretching from the Baltic to the Black seas, had by 1795—in the midst of the French Revolution—been entirely partitioned between Austria, Russia, and Prussia. Polish volunteers had often formed key components of Napoleon's army because of their discontent at their loss of independence. Alexander I came to Vienna determined to reconstitute a Polish kingdom out of the remains of Eastern Europe. However, the other allied nations knew the Tsar's plan would be a flimsy excuse to add yet more to the demesne of famously rapacious Tsardom. Collectively Castlereagh and Metternich were determined to keep Russia from annexing more territory than necessary. Prussia, meanwhile, entered Vienna as perhaps the most revanchist nation at the Congress. Most of the bloody battles of the war had been fought over Prussian territory, and Napoleon had almost entirely dismembered the state at various points throughout the conflict. Saxony, a monarchical state then contiguous to Prussia, had unfortunately remained loyal to Napoleon throughout the war of the sixth coalition. What better way to secure the future of the Prussian state and to reward a victorious ally then the annexation of the traitorous Saxon kingdom? Alexander and the Prussian minister entered Vienna allied to each other's goals and fully determined to achieve them. Metternich and Castlereagh, however, were equally determined to ensure that this aggrandizement did not happen. Metternich feared future wars with a vastly augmented Prussia and Russia, and Castlereagh feared the potential threat of Russia dominating the European Continent. The eventual result of weeks of diplomatic machinations—which ridiculously included plans for moving Saxony wholesale from eastern Germany to western Germany—was a Prussia compensated with lands on the Rhine bordering France as well as a fair portion of Saxony and a Poland ostensibly promised some measure of self-government but really existing as a droit of the Russian crown. For more information see Mark Jarrett pages 96-130 and 158-164.

and were now officially recognized as being a part of the Russian crown. Meanwhile, the Congress compensated Prussia with lands along the Rhine and lands taken from the Kingdom of Saxony—whose monarch had unfortunately remained loyal to Napoleon until the end. Importantly, because the lands given to Prussia had never at any point been rightfully hers to claim and because Russia also had no real legal claim to rule over Poland, the Whigs felt that this settlement had really been nothing more than a tyrannical land grab.

In much the same way, the Whigs were offended by the Bourbon Restoration. The Hundred Days, Napoleon's last attempt to retain power over France, had been spectacularly successful. Armies which were supposed to be loyal to the new king, Louis XVIII, had instead joined the emperor in his final *coup d'état*. Louis had ignominiously fled. In only two weeks the French monarchy—an institution which the allies had supposed would finally bring peace to a devastated France—had again fallen. Apparently the idea that legitimacy would, in and of itself, be able to keep France peaceable was not true. The problem in the Whig's view was compounded because after the Hundred Days, an occupation force, headed by England, remained in France to keep Louis on the throne.[146] Why should the French not be allowed to choose their own monarch?

It was obvious to the Whig authors writing for *The Edinburgh Review* that the French people were largely unsure about their new monarch. There was a great deal of misinformation being spread about by parties in France, but it was certainly true that it had been over twenty-five years since the French had known or cared about the Bourbon family. Most of the French people, therefore, had never been loyal to a Bourbon king. Why should they now be made to feel any artificial attachment? That it was artificial was proved by the current state of France as an

[146] Ibid., 158-164.

occupied nation. No one in France really wanted Louis on the throne, and, furthermore, the brother of Louis XVI would surely restore ancient tyrannies—the very things which the French had revolted against. Indeed, Louis had proved himself an enemy of the people when he returned to France after Napoleon's final defeat.[147] Unfortunately, England's role in the entire affair did not speak well of the nation. "We have no right to interfere—We have no interest to interfere—And our interference is most likely to defeat the objects for which it is undertaken, and to ruin the peace and the liberties of all Europe, while it brings this nation to speedy bankruptcy, disorder, and dishonour [sic]."[148] In keeping Louis XVIII on the throne after the French nation had refused him upon Napoleon's return, England had in reality supported that "old slavish absurdity of the *jus divinum* of kings" which could not "decently be asserted in any country that [had] the smallest pretensions to liberty."[149] Another article in the next volume of *The Edinburgh Review* on the same subject bemoaned that it was now thought dangerous to criticize the acts of foreign governments. There was nothing "more truly ominous to English liberty itself" than a fear of open and honest discussion because it proved that there was an active and open corruption within English institutions which ought to be checked.[150] It was the government which had supported the restoration of Louis XVIII against the will of the people of France. How could this be justified by anything other, asked the Whig press, than the same principles which would have justified James II's restoration to the throne in 1688? Tory views about legitimacy and sovereignty, as shown in the forced restoration of the French king, would make the English constitution a plaything for an absolute king at home in England.

[147] "France," 25, 502, 503, 504, 505-506, 512.
[148] Ibid., 520.
[149] Ibid., 521.
[150] "Letters from France," 216.

Tory authors countered these arguments in several key ways. England and the allied monarchs had restored the Bourbon monarchy in France because what the French needed now, after decades of upheaval, was above all things "fidelity." The last government which had ruled France peacefully had been the old monarchy—thus the restoration. Furthermore, Whig claims that the old despotisms of the monarchy were being restored were false. In the principles of the new Bourbon monarchy, one could see the best ideas of the true Whigs of old. It was upon law that the new monarchy was built—the law of the Charter, a constitution granted by Louis XVIII. There was to be a new legislative body built upon the precedent of the English example. The only thing which the new monarchy was actively doing away with was the system of immorality which the Revolution had put into place. This was why the people of France had not been able to successfully resist Napoleon when he landed from Elba. Only through a constant vigilance could morality be restored. The sure loyalty of good and true Frenchmen would ensure that France would never again see the "Terrorism of Robespierre."[151] Another article published in *The British Critic* stated that the best hope for the future of France lay in the legal title of Louis to the throne and not in the Jacobinal doctrines of "original compact and conditional obedience." The author observed that unfortunately these doctrines still found their voice "in this country also."[152] Jacobinism and the forces of disorder and irreligion were not dead, and the Tory press cast those who disagreed with the Bourbon restoration as Jacobins born anew. They were men who wished to turn the legitimate rule of law into a cipher for the will of the masses.

In addition to the problems the Whigs felt the Bourbon Restoration raised, they were also worried by the issue of compensation and the illegal shifts of territory countenanced at the

[151] Anon, [John Croker], "Chateaubriand's Monarchy," *The Quarterly Review* 15, no. 30 (1816): 420-423, 432, 435, 440. (See *The Quarterly Review under Gifford*, page 52).

[152] Anon, "Carnot's Letter to the King of France," *The British Critic* 3, (1815): 163, 159.

Congress of Vienna. An article published in *The Edinburgh Review* set out to overview the various partitions of Poland. The author argued that it was the partition of Poland in the 1790s, not the French Revolution, which had begun the true unraveling of Europe. Before that event nations had been able to put faith in even their enemies, and they could be secure in the knowledge that defeat in war would not lead to annihilation. After that partition no nation could be secure of another nation's designs. It was no coincidence, according to the Whigs, that the same nations which had cut Poland up in the 1790s—Russia, Prussia, and Austria—had continued their illegal capers at the Congress of Vienna and were currently the allies of England.[153] The destruction of a free people should never be thought of lightly. Freedom was the most important attribute of a nation: had not the barons at Runnymede, by taking their freedoms, ensured England's then future and now current glory?[154] The sovereigns of Europe had destroyed the freedom of Poland. Their act provided the "model of all those acts of rapine" committed during the French Revolution, and it had, by proxy, disrespected the Bill of Rights and the Constitution of England.[155]

For the Whigs, it was worrying that the English government had been party to this system of tyranny again and again during the Napoleonic wars.[156] Before the Congress of Vienna, the good faith of the English government had been renowned. After the Congress, England had shown herself a false friend to the people of the continent and to her own self.[157] Tories spouted fidelity and law and order. However, asked the Whig press, did not the very idea of compensation prove the Tories liars? A Tory government, in the person of Castlereagh, had

[153] "Partitions," 465.
[154] Ibid., 495.
[155] Ibid., 516, 526.
[156] Ibid., 524.
[157] "Reflections on The Conduct of The Allies," 43.

allowed Prussia to take Saxony and Russia to take Poland. Compensation proved the government a liar and it proved their ideas of legitimacy and sovereignty lies. Essentially, the Whigs claimed that compensation showed that any Tory claim to a restoration of a pre-Revolution status quo was a lie.[158]

To the Tories, however, the peace of Vienna had, in large part, been entirely necessary. An article published *The Pamphleteer* stated that a new system of European relations had been created at the Congress of Vienna and that compensation had been a necessary part of the new system. The most important consideration was a balance of power between the states which ensured that France could never again threaten Europe. Of necessity the balance of power had to trump the restoration of old pre-war states. This did not mean that the return of *de jure* states was not important; rather, such ideas had to be moderated by the realities of Europe.[159] Prussia had been compensated because her size before the French wars had been insufficient to hold back the revolutionary armies. If this was not entirely just, what really mattered was that England not interfere with any of the treaties established at the end of the wars. Honesty and honor required that England not interfere.[160] Whigs, because they felt that the war had been fought for freedom, argued that the appearance of tyranny on the continent required more interference. Tories, because they felt that the war had been fought against disorder, argued for non-interference provided that the revolutionary principles of France did not again threaten to gain a systemic hold in any nation. The Congress had established a new legal system which must at all costs be respected. Territorial compensation might indeed have been unfair, as an article (published with some reserve communicated by the editor) in *The Maga* expressed. However, it was important to

[158] Anon, "The States of Wirtemberg," *The Edinburgh Review* 29, no. 58 (1818): 361.
[159] Anon, "The State of the Nation," *The Pamphleteer* 20, no. 39 (1822): 40.
[160] Ibid., 40, 43, 45-46, 48.

avoid going too far in committing England to war against tyranny—which was to be much less feared than Jacobin principles.[161]

For the Whigs, the issues of the Bourbon Restoration and compensation at the Congress of Vienna were both prime examples of an English failure. The ministry was complicit to both issues. Both betrayed a definite tyrannical and arbitrary principle at work behind the scenes. The allied governments had disregarded the French people's right to choose their monarch; they had punished the Saxon people for the crimes of their ruler; and they had abandoned the Poles. All this demonstrated that the inalienable rights of the people had certainly been controverted—with the permission, so-to-speak, of the English government—which was supposed to be founded on the choice of the people. Obviously, something had gone wrong. The Tories, on the contrary, maintained that the Whig's continued insistence on popular rights made them party to the same mistaken idea which had first given birth to the excesses of the French Revolution. Whig ideas contravened law and the established order; they needed to be exculpated; if they were not, revolution would threaten to overthrow the Constitution. Both parties felt that the Constitution was in danger; they identified two very different reasons; and they both attempted to define and defend their position by using continental issues. The freedom of the press was another such topic. To the Tories, a great deal of the danger came from the licentiousness of the press which allowed the dangerous Jacobin ideas to the spread to the masses. In their minds the press perhaps had too much free reign.

To the Whigs, however, the freedom of the press was perhaps the most important right to defend and concurrently one of the most threatened by the Tory ministry. Many men throughout Europe would have agreed. Control and limitation of the press on the continent and in England

[161] "The Congress," 651-652, 652n.

was for the Whigs a serious issue. One, of among many, reasons they felt England had fought the war was to ensure liberty of the press. However, the continental leaders, Metternich being one of them, felt quite differently. When on 23 March 1819 Karl Sand of Prussia assassinated a prominent journalist who wrote against reform, Metternich acted quickly to limit the freedom of the press and the right to hold public meetings. The Carlsbad Decrees stipulated a censorship of all publications longer than twenty pages, forbade German university students to enter into associations, and decreed a state commission to oversee all teachers throughout Germany. Meanwhile in England agitation for reform had led to a violent suppression of a public meeting in Manchester in which several people died. Later that year, Parliament enacted the Six Acts which severely limited the press and the right to public association. As Lord Castlereagh argued, there was a real necessity to prevent Jacobin agitation throughout the nation. The amount of real Jacobin agitation was arguably very small; however, the discovery of a plot to assassinate the entire cabinet in 1820 certainly seemed to support Castlereagh's fears.[162] The Tory press consistently attempted to counter Whig arguments in favor of an unlimited press with the fear of revolutionary agitation spreading both at home and abroad.

To the Whig press, this was a ridiculous assertion meant to stop any attempt to do away with governmental corruption and attack against the liberties of all Englishmen. The only way for tyranny and despotism to get a firm hold in any nation rested on the destruction of the free press. Taking the precedent of the libel law as it currently existed in England, an article in *The Edinburgh Review* argued that a conviction for libel should have as part of its prerequisites an investigation of whether or not the accusation of the supposed libeler was true. That is, if a person were to insult another it should not be libel if the insult could be proved true. Applied to

[162] Jarrett, 217-223.

the press, the libel law allowed the government to prosecute for libel without having to prove that the accusations made by the supposedly guilty publication were false. In other words, "as the law now stands, there is something quite revolting in the powers given to rulers." Furthermore, what did the English government have to fear from libel? Muzzling the press was the tool of a tyrant; no just and lawful government could ever need fear open discussion.[163] The surest way to ensure that rulers never overstepped their authority and were always in line with the needs of their subjects was to allow the subjects free reign of complaint.[164] The libel law had given the English government the power to subvert the Constitution and institute a reign of tyranny by labeling everything said against its actions, no matter how reasonable, as Jacobinism.[165] Because the Whigs placed the legitimacy of a government in the consent of the governed, the freedom of the press was very important to them because the press was the institution which allowed the people to pass judgment on their rulers. Tory attempts to limit the press were in reality attempts to chain up the voice of the people and constituted an attack against the true English Constitution.

Numerous Tory authors replied that the press's freedom had in fact gone too far. In the words of an article in *The Maga*, the normal papers and periodicals of England were almost entirely designed to agitate the people against their government. There was nothing these men hated more than the king of England.[166] Indeed, freedom of the press had brought in a most terrible disrespect for religion and king. Everyone could read but few could understand, and every little faction had its own press which spewed forth noxious ideas into the minds of the

[163] "Liberty of the Press and its Abuses," 103, 104, 106, 109, 120-121,
[164] Ibid., 129.
[165] Ibid., 139.
[166] "Late Sins of the Public Prints," 354.

ignorant.[167] "Of all engines of mischief which were ever yet employed for the destruction of mankind, the press is the most formidable, when perverted in its uses, as it was by the Revolutionists in France, and is at this time by the Revolutionists in England."[168] Tories felt that the press was the most terrible weapon of the Jacobins in France and that it ought to be more limited in England to ensure that no revolution would threaten the English state.

It was the Whigs and their press who spread the false idea that the voice of God resided in the people as a whole. In the words of *The Quarterly*, this message had destroyed societies throughout history: in Greece it had killed Socrates and in Jerusalem it had killed Christ. It was a message fundamentally directed against Tory sovereignty—because it called the people the source of authority—and against Tory religion—because the message undermined an ideal obedience and replaced it with a different Christian ideal which did away with the necessary intermediate of either church or king. These were the terrible fountainheads of the French Revolution, and it was the responsibility of the government to protect the people from themselves and save the English Constitution from revolution.[169]

The issues of compensation, restoration, and the press were all important contributors to the heightened rhetorical conflict of the time. Each of these issues were, to the Whigs, crises which proved that tyranny was spreading throughout Europe, and, because the Whigs argued that the Tories were complicit in the spread of tyranny at home, the Whigs believed that the Tories were an integral part of the danger. For the Tories, the mere fact that the Whigs made crises out of these issues proved that the dangerous lies of the French Revolution were still active. Each Whig rhetorical claim of tyrannical crisis or Tory counter claim against Whig melodrama and

[167] "Remarks on the Principles of the Eclectic Review," 195-196.
[168] [Robert Southey], "Parliamentary Reform," 273.
[169] Ibid., 275-278.

licentiousness made a constitutional middle ground, which could embrace individuals from both sides of the issue, more and more impossible. However, the revolutions in Spain and Naples were two events which were more important to the destruction of the middle ground than were the issues of the restoration or compensation. The Spanish and Neapolitan revolutions made it possible for the Whigs to use the Greek Revolution to its full extent. Both revolutions were eventually suppressed by the Holy Alliance. The suppression sent the Whig press into an uproar. This uproar was the result of the obvious and, to the Whig mind, dangerous spread of arbitrary tyranny—a tyranny ever so much more clearly represented by the Ottoman Turks, the analogue to the Holy Alliance. The nature of the Holy Alliance, the actions it took, and the English government's association with it led to rhetorical difficulties for the Tories, and this was later compounded with the eruption of the Greek Revolution.

Technically, the Holy Alliance was one of the two international agreements which emerged after Bonaparte's second defeat at Waterloo. It was the brainchild of Tsar Alexander. The Tsar, deeply affected by the long decades of war and openly recognized as a testy, somewhat mad individual, determined to create an alliance of Christian thrones in order to make sure that war never broke out again. It was meant to bring Christian ideals openly into the political sphere. However, "what the Tsar had intended as an alliance of rulers and peoples became [through the alterations of Metternich] a federation of Monarchs."[170] Both Castlereagh and Metternich, representatives of England and Austria at the second peace of Paris, thought the Holy Alliance nothing more than systemic nonsense. However, both also recognized that placating the Tsar was important, and all the major European powers adhered to the treaty. What is interesting about the Holy Alliance is that it specifically sought to use universalist Christian values to combat the evils

[170] Jarrett, 175-178.

of the French Revolution. In essence, there must again be a visible Church.[171] This was alarming to many Englishmen, and not just the Whigs either. A visible and universal church sounded very much like a Catholic church; arguably the same Catholic Church James II would have restored if he had remained on the throne in 1688. The Holy Alliance, as an anti-revolutionary organization might be appealing to some, but there was always a deep suspicion of the true motives of the continental sovereigns party to it. For example, the Whigs and other, more radical, politicians and writers in England took up the name of the Holy Alliance as a name for the entire Congress System created by the other, more substantial, agreement signed at the second peace of Paris.[172]

The Quadruple Alliance was the final treaty signed by the four victorious powers after they again successfully occupied and defeated France. It was meant to ensure that Revolutionary France would never again become a threat. The sixth article of the treaty lay the foundation for what has become known as the Congress system. In order to secure the terms of the alliance, the contracting parties would "renew their meetings at fixed periods, either under the immediate auspices of the Sovereigns themselves, or by their respective Ministers, for the purpose of consulting upon their common interests."[173] Louis XVIII had not been able to maintain his throne. The Congress system would ensure that all the nations who fought and defeated Napoleon would again be obligated to answer the call to war against any other revolutionary upheaval in France which might arise. The question, however, would soon become if the Quadruple Alliance and the Congress System would obligate the nations to respond to Revolution elsewhere.[174]

[171] Ibid., 177-178.
[172] Ibid., 173.
[173] Ibid., 168.
[174] Ibid., 170.

Two such major upheavals did erupt, one in Spain and the other in the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. The importance of the Spanish Revolution vis-à-vis this work lies in the discussion of the Spanish Constitution, the independence of the Spanish colonies, and the legality—or illegality—of the Spanish Cortes. After the end of the Revolutionary wars, Spain was, quite simply, a mess. The long Peninsular War had been extraordinarily violent. The term "guerilla war" come from this conflict for good reason. The economy was a shambles. The only way for Spain to get out of the mess was through her colonies and the revenue they might provide.[175] Therein lay a problem, however.

In 1808 Spain had helped France conquer Portugal. King Charles IV and his ministry were deeply unpopular because of the vast numbers of French troops in Spain. Charles's son, Ferdinand, much more popular with the people, took advantage of his popularity to force his father to change his ministry. Instead Charles abdicated in favor of Ferdinand. However, this was far from the end of the dynastic tomfoolery because when French forces occupied Madrid—thereby opening the Peninsular war between France and Spain—Charles IV was put back on the throne. Napoleon put an end to the problem when he summoned both monarchs to France and took the crown away from both of them to give it to his brother.[176] Spain was therefore left with no monarch. Napoleon's armies ran rampant throughout Spain, but they were unable to take Cadiz in the far south. The city became a center for the Spanish resistance. And with no king, a regency ruled in the name of Ferdinand and called together a parliament, or Cortes, to write a constitution for the nation. In 1812 they unveiled it—and it was, if one will pardon the expression, a doozy. It had a unicameral legislative body; it placed sovereignty in the hands of

[175] Ibid., 224.

[176] Richard Stites, *The Four Horsemen: Riding to Liberty in Post-Napoleonic Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 33.

the nation; and it severely limited the powers of the Monarch.[177] It was a polarizing document both at home and abroad.

The confusing state of the metropolitan nation left the Spanish colonies to shift for themselves. By 1815 when Ferdinand returned to power, most of them were de facto independent polities. Furthermore, Ferdinand, with the backing of Spanish Ultra Royalists, refused to recognize the Constitution of 1812. The new king restored many of the abusive institutions of the pre-revolutionary regime while at the same time attempting to raise enough money to reconquer his rebellious colonies. It was in one of these new armies, where low pay and illness made living almost unbearable, that a young colonel instigated a rebellion against the king in the name of the Constitution of 1812.[178] Within a month Ferdinand agreed to re-issue the Constitution. This revolution was initially allowed to happen, more because none of the allied courts could agree as to what should be done. Castlereagh especially rejected Russian proposals to intervene against the new Spanish government. The State Paper of 20 May 1820 he issued in protest of such proposed actions became an important lynchpin for the Tories in their defense of the government against Whig claims of complicity to the dangerous, tyrannical Holy Alliance.

However, almost immediately upon the heels of the Spanish Revolution, another one broke out in the Two Sicilies. Much like the Spanish, the restored Bourbon monarchy in Naples faced enormous financial difficulties while it simultaneously attempted to restore many of the institutions which had existed before Napoleon's conquest. Ferdinand IV of Naples, an insipid character, did nothing to alleviate the stresses of his subjects.[179] As a consequence, a revolutionary society, known as the Carbonari, became widely popular in certain parts of

[177] Ibid., 39-45.
[178] Ibid., 57, 59-60, 28.
[179] Jarrett, 276.

southern Italy. They established a secret shadow government in Sicily with the avowed goal of bringing constitutional rule to the country.[180] The example of the Spanish revolution inspired pre-emptive action, and on 9 July 1820 a revolutionary army of regular troops and Carbonari militia paraded a copy of the Spanish Constitution through the streets of the city of Naples.[181]

The Revolution in Naples triggered a series of Congresses at Troppau and at Laibach in which the governments of Russia, Austria, and Prussia agreed—despite the protests of the English government—to an international intervention meant to put down the revolt in Naples.[182] The Troppau Circular, a manifesto of allied intentions, became an especially cogent and threatening document within the English political press. After the sudden, precipitate defeat of the Neapolitan rebels in early 1821, events seemed destined to calm down. However, events in Spain over the course of 1821 led to a radicalization of the new government. A failed counter-revolution in 1822 and the resulting imprisonment of the Bourbon Monarch, Ferdinand VII, exacerbated matters. Louis XVIII of France felt obligated to defend his cousin. At the same time, the French government—unsure of its own popularity—sought to bolster its image through foreign adventurism. The French, disregarding the careful planning put into place at the Congress of Verona earlier that year, finally acted unilaterally to suppress the Revolutionary Spanish government in the spring of 1823.[183] The French expedition was astonishingly successful, and the French restored the legitimate monarchy and government of Spain by early summer, 1823.[184]

[180] Richard Billington, *Fire in the Minds of Men: Origins of the Revolutionary Faith* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2011), 132-133.
[181] Jarrett, 233-234.
[182] Ibid., 264-265, 270-275.
[183] Ibid., 313, 338-340.
[184] Ibid., 341.

For the Whigs at home in England, the import of these events revolved around the threatening decisions taken by Austria and France to intervene against revolutions which the Whigs believed had rightly taken place against corrupt governments illegally restored in 1815. They defended the Spanish Cortes's right to create a Constitution for the nation and the Carbonari's right to change the abusive regime in Naples. Furthermore, the Whigs felt the English government had not done enough to prevent illegal interventions against governments which had, obviously, attempted to establish themselves on the same principles as those which underwrote the true English Constitution. The government was either secretly or openly complicit in a conspiracy against liberty led by the Holy Alliance and quickly spreading across all of Europe.

Tories countered the Whig views by associating both the Spanish Constitution and the Carbonari societies with the French Revolution and its principles. Furthermore, they attempted to show how the Whig view of the English Constitution would undermine the foundations of the nation's empire globally because of its insistence on the rights of the governed and the liberties of the people. As with the Bourbon restoration, Tory polemicists felt that, even though both the Spanish and Neapolitan governments were not ideal, both Spain and Naples needed governments which ruled through established laws and precedents, not on principles directly analogous to the French revolution. The Holy Alliance was alternatively not something worthy of taking seriously, or it was a just combination of continental sovereigns meant to protect Europe from the despotism of the people. Again, the rhetorical debate turned on the possible associations each party was able to make against the other party and their interpretation of the English Constitution.

For the Whigs, Napoleon's tyranny was the same as the tyranny of both Ferdinand's, in Spain and Sicily. Constantly insisting upon the similarities created an atmosphere redolent of the same imagery taken up by any number of authors since the 300 Spartans first stood against the tyranny of Xerxes. The world, for the Whigs, stood on the brink of disaster. Despite this, however, with both the Spanish and Sicilian revolutions, the Tories were able to counter effectively by making connections to the forces and beliefs which they believed had engulfed the world in war thirty years before. The strength of the Tory argument could last as long as it was possible to continue making these connections.

When it came to the Spanish Revolution, the Whigs attempted to argue in favor of both the Cortes and the Spanish Constitution. An article published in *The Westminster Review*, for example, wrote that the Spanish Constitution, despite its defects, had been accepted by the large majority of the nation. It was impossible to create a perfect work at the first attempt, and the Spanish, if they had been given time, would have fixed the problems in the document. Unfortunately, the despots of the Holy Alliance—schooled in the tyranny of Bonaparte—never gave the new Spanish government the chance to correct their mistakes. "From the very moment when a constitution founded on the sovereignty of the people was re-established in Spain, by means of that sovereignty, all the monarchs of Europe, either openly or insidiously, placed themselves in a state of real hostility against the Spanish nation and its new government."[185] This included the English monarchy, which, despite an ostensible profession of dislike for the French intervention, used its influence to encourage French success in Spain. The fall of the constitutional government in Spain brought back all the old abuses of torture and tyranny. The overthrow of her liberty, "so much applauded by the enemies of reform," might temporarily

[185] "Spain," 290-291, 292-293.

setback international liberty, but eventually, said *The Westminster*, liberty would win.[186] The English people had been for the liberties of the Spanish, but the ministry perverted their wishes and put down freedom.[187]

An article published in *The Edinburgh Review* turned to the justification of the Cortes and the Constitution. The conquest of Spain by the French had "destroyed all lawful power;" therefore, the Cortes "were called together to give their country a regular government."[188] Authority had, in essence, reverted back to its original source in the absence of the legal source which the French had destroyed. This was an appeal over and against the ideal of legal Tory legitimacy, as well as an unmistakable comparison to the Tory idea about the events of 1688—when England had found itself without a legal monarch and the parliament had acted in the sovereign's stead. Next the author turned to legal recognition that the English, and allied governments had given to the Cortes.[189] This meant that the French, Russian, and Austrian actions taken against the Constitution government in 1814 when they restored Ferdinand to absolute power had in reality been illegal.[190] Furthermore, when the monarchs of the Holy Alliance had again acted against the revolutionary Spanish government in the 1820s, they justified themselves through a "'MONARCHICAL PRINCIPLE,' which *recognizes no institution as legitimate that does not flow spontaneously from the monarch* [emphasis in original]."[191] The government's response had been "tardy," "feeble," and "ambiguous."

Taking the proclamation of the Holy Alliance and the inferiority of the English response, *The Edinburgh Review* argued that the precedent thereby established would give the right to all

[186] Ibid., 318, 334.
[187] Ibid., 316.
[188] "*The Holy Alliance* verses *Spain*," 242.
[189] Ibid., 243-244.
[190] Ibid., 246.
[191] This an interpretation of the Troppau Circular.

the continental governments to forever ensure that no government ever improved itself. In other words it would give Morocco a right to "make war against England for setting the example of a pure administration at Gibraltar."[192] In conclusion these actions taken against Spain and Naples were:

> the first step, in short, of a crusade against liberty and national independence, and in support of despotism in its most revolting and offensive form; and is therefore an inchoate attack, of the most formidable and unequivocal nature, on those principles which this country has, above all others, the strongest and most direct interest to maintain…. and is, beyond all question, a manifest impeachment not only of the Revolution of 1688, but of the fundamental principles and daily practice of the British Constitution.[193]

Clearly then, said the Whigs, the suppression of the Spanish Constitution would inevitably equal a suppression of the English Constitution, and just as England had fought against despotism in the 1790s, so it should fight against despotism in the 1820s to save both its own liberty and the liberty of all peoples. The Spanish Constitution, despite some regrettable errors, was really the same as the English Constitution because it recognized the same principles of sovereignty and legitimacy.[194] Indeed, the English and the Spanish Constitution contained the same errors in how they dealt with Christianity. Time was needed, however, to correct the abuses of both documents: it had already run out for the Spanish and if care was not taken, it would run out for the English as well.

[192] Ibid., 248, 250-251.
[193] Ibid., 260-261.
[194] Count Toreno's Pamphlet &c." 11-12.

These Whig views were, to the Tory author of an article in *The British Critic*, excessively bigoted. The Whigs were far too attached to the principles of the mob and rebellions to see that the Spanish rebellion against the constituted monarchy—no matter how terrible that monarchy might have been—meant to establish a new Jacobinism. Jacobinism had killed more people "'in one day, than the Inquisitions of Spain [and] Portugal…had in three centuries."'[195] This is a remarkable defense of a Catholic institution of admitted horror published in a Church funded periodical, and it points to the danger that the Tory authors felt was threatening all of Europe. An article in *The Maga*, published before the collapse of both the Spanish and Neapolitan republican governments, argued that if republican principles gained a foothold in Spain and Italy, then France would inevitably follow, then Germany would fall, and then where would England find herself? Without allies, in a "mighty cemetery" of governments, England would have to watch while the literal apocalypse engulfed the entire world in "terror, judgment, and ruin."[196]

Another anonymous article published in *The Maga*, taking a less chilialistic line, attempted to defend the English Constitution through an attack against the rebellious Spanish colonies. The Whigs in England maintained that the Spanish colonies ought to be provided with a constitution based on the English, but in doing so, they betrayed a basic misunderstanding of what a constitution was. The ignorant servile people of the Spanish colonies, or indeed of the Spanish metropole, could not just be given a constitution. A constitution grew slowly, and adapted itself to the particular intelligence and capabilities of the people who formed it. Freedom and liberty could only come after a long process of learning and education, trial and error. The new constitutions in the erstwhile nations of South America were based on false ideas of equality; "the possession of liberty and the destruction of all that can nurture liberty." Much like

[195] Anon, "Blaquiere's Review of the Spanish Revolution," *The British Critic* 18, (1822): 471-472, 479.
[196] "The Congress," 655-656.

France in the 1790s, the Spanish colonies and the revolutionized Spanish metropole had sought to extend revolutionary despotism across Europe. They had attempted to subvert all the governments of Europe, and the intervention of France, in Spain, was entirely justified.[197] In conclusion the author firmly posited a fundamental difference between the English Constitution and the Spanish Constitution. The Whigs, in joining themselves to the Spanish cause, "renounced…constitutional principles, and [they] have become enemies of…liberty."[198] The core message of both of these Tory publications was that the English and the Spanish Constitution were different because each was based on two different principles. The Spanish Constitution came from the Revolution, and it spread a message about sovereignty and legitimacy incompatible with true Englishness, and, therefore, the Whigs in agreeing with it proved themselves false Englishmen.

As in the case of the Spanish Revolution, the Whigs attempted to use the Neapolitan revolt to prove that the Tory ministry was complicit to an international conspiracy of despotism. Again the fundamental idea revolved around the contention that the Neapolitans had the right to change their government according to their own needs. The revolution had been the genuine wish of the people, the reforms they engendered, no matter how ill-advised, could not be an excuse for international intervention.[199] If reform could justify intervention, as the Continental sovereigns openly avowed, then the Constitution of England was under threat. The ministry had not truly understood what was at stake; they had not protested loudly enough; they had not

[197] "South America," 136, 137, 139. The truth of these claims is debatable, nevertheless, it is certainly true that the author of this article exaggerated the capabilities of the Spanish government. The will may have been there, but the means were not. For a more detailed analysis of Spanish attempts to spread Revolution across Europe, see *The Four Horsemen* pages 70-98 and passim.

[198] "South America," 143.

[199] "Naples," 79-81, see also Anon, "Italy," *The Edinburgh Review* 40, no. 79 (1824): 208-219.

stopped the intervention. The government, and the Tory party was therefore guilty of attempting to subvert the power of parliament. The Tories incorrectly labeled the Carbonari a revolutionary society when they were in reality the "*people* of the Neapolitan dominions."[200] Again and again the Whigs hammered home their interpretation of the English Constitution by arguing that the ministry was engaged in an attack against the true principles of 1688 in their attempts to suppress the freedom of other peoples. As an article published in *The Pamphleteer* by an anonymous author stated, "the people of these free realms, the throne of which stands…on principles directly adverse to the only legitimate title acknowledged by the Sovereigns [of the continent]" cannot "view with indifference the consolidation of a system which…must inevitably come into mortal conflict with their own laws and liberties."[201]

Tory authors countered the Whig uses of the Neapolitan Revolution with accusations centered on the military nature of the early stages, especially the march on the capital. Additionally, it was easy for the Tories to associate the Carbonari with Revolutionary societies much the same, if not exactly the same, as those which spread the disease of the Revolution throughout France in the 1790s.[202] Although the tyranny of the Neapolitan government was not optimal, "the *principle* by which one part of the community take upon themselves to overthrow the existing order of things, and with drawn swords in their hands, to impose a new order of things, upon their country, cannot be tolerated even for one moment as a *principle*."[203] To the Tory authors, such ideas—the very basis of the Whig party—controverted all law and threatened

[200] "Naples," 85, 87, 90, 91.
[201] "The Declaration of England against the Acts and Projects of The Holy Alliance," 8.
[202] "Sketch of the late Revolution at Naples," 663-665. For more information on the potential links between the Carbonari and other revolutionary societies, see Fire in the Minds of Men 130-134.
[203] Ibid., 662.

to bring an end to all peace and stability. The people ought to never be considered the basis of authority because they could destroy all order simply through the exercise of ignorant whimsy.

The Holy Alliance, both in its real actions and its imagined intentions, contributed perhaps more than anything else to the heightened rhetorical conflict between the two parties. The Whig press continually connected the tyranny of the Holy Alliance to the views of the ministry. The government had not taken the Holy Alliance seriously, and it's too late protestations at the despotical association's actions were mincing generalities more puff and smoke than anything meaningful.[204] England had "tacitly" agreed to the prescriptions of the Holy Alliance; her government had "openly promulgate[d] the detested doctrines of an indefeasible and divine authority."[205] The right of thrones which the Tory government was guilty of agreeing with threatened to destroy liberty and freedom all over the world. When, for instance, the people broke oaths extracted forcefully, they were guilty of "*treason*." Kings, on the other hand, who violated laws and promises upheld a most justified "*liberty.*"[206] Everything was all wrong. What was needed was an anti-Holy Alliance in which England, France, and Portugal (all variously capable of being described as representative governments) combined with the numerous small states of Europe. "The union of arbitrary Sovereigns must be counteracted by a union among all States which have made their own Constitutions."[207]

For the Tory ministry and their press, the idea that the English Constitution had been *made*, as such, was a core part of the problem with Whig doctrines. It led the Whigs to unfairly attack and calumniate the continental governments. Leaving room to doubt if the Holy Alliance

[204] "Naples," 81-82.
[205] Anon, "Portugal," *The Edinburgh Review* 45, no. 89 (1827): 237. Peter, 226.
[206] "Prospects of the Holy Alliance—Stability of the French Government," 517.
[207] "The Declaration of England against the Acts and Projects of The Holy Alliance," 12-13.

was anything other than a phantasm of the Whigs, it was true that these governments were not perhaps ideal.[208] But as the long years of warfare against France and Bonaparte should have shown the Whigs, the continental sovereigns had helped England save the world from revolutionary upheaval. "The enemies who were annihilated by the Holy Alliance, were the enemies of the Constitution of England."[209] The Spanish and Neapolitan actions had been rebellious actions against a legally constituted authority. The rebels had imprisoned their kings; their so called constitutions had been proved useless; and they had replaced genuine liberty with an illusion. The Whigs in supporting their revolutionary cause abroad proved themselves traitors to the Constitution. Even worse, they had purposefully jumbled their vision of freedom with the cause of God and man—thereby most shamefully deceiving the people of England.[210] They were attempting, just like the French had done, to raise liberty "upon the ruins of religion and public morals—of civil obedience, and all the principles that hold society together."[211]

The Tory constitution interpreted Sovereignty as entirely separate from the people who long ago had given it up to the king. Laws ensured that society would continue on as before, and God's providence watched over everything with a benevolent eye. This vision of society and government was, to the Whigs, a base betrayal of what had really happened in 1688 when the English had deposed a tyrannical king and ensured themselves liberty—the best and only means of securing the future happiness of society. Tory religious beliefs were terrible, tyrannical perversions of the true nature of a God who wanted his creatures to be happy, and who had provided them with the gift of reason so that they could live their lives as best as possible.

[208] "The State of the Nation," 41.
[209] "The Liberal System," 451.
[210] "The State of Europe and The Holy Alliance," 322, 323, 324.
[211] Ibid., 332.

Each party maneuvered for rhetorical advantage by using these various issues. Whigs attacked the Tories, naming them virtual successors of James II's tyranny. The Tories countered with accusations of Whiggish revolutionary complicity. As time progressed, the incompatibility of the two constitutional interpretations fueled this self-same rhetorical conflict. It was often quite a violent conflict, as might be expected when the participants increasingly cast their continued survival, and the continued survival of their constitutional interpretation, on the coherence of their ability to prove the guilt of the opposing party.

For example, the Whigs accused the Tory party and ministry of paying vulgar and inflammatory criminals to debase the common people—calling them the "'lowest scrum of the populace."'[212] These men, whom the government paid, sold a "vile traffic in sedition, immorality, and infidelity…exciting some of the worst passions of human nature."[213] These men hated freedom in all its forms; they were "genuine lovers of Royalty for its own sake, and determined enemies of all popular rights."[214] Ignorant, intemperate, inconsistent, liars and cheats, scurrilous fools, religious bigots, and arbitrary oligarchs, they ruled according to the "Powers of Evil." Much like the "bond between sorcerer and…familiar demon" stipulated that no witchcraft ever be used for the good, these men were bound to the "purposes of evil."[215] For this reason they twisted and perverted all truth—accusing the Whigs of possession when it was they who were really possessed. The Tories were unfortunately members of the "same species."[216] Worst of all, in the words on one accuser, the Tories would have gladly been present at the crucifixion of Christ and they would have loyally killed innocents and "put Jesus to death."[217] As insults

[212] EdR vol 32, 302-303.
[213] "State of the Country," 305.
[214] "Naples," 73. "High Tory Principles," 5.
[215] Anon, "The Present Administration," *The Edinburgh Review* 46, no. 91 (1827): 247, 254, 259-260.
[216] "The Present Administration," 246.
[217] "High Tory Principles," 14n.

escalated, terminology often came to operate within a religious sphere. Good and evil battled for the hearts of the nation and control of the Constitution.

Tories, on the other hand, had a penchant for describing their enemies as either disease ridden or a disease in and of themselves. The Whigs spread "contagion" which was "fearfully malignant."[218] Infidelity and disloyalty were synonymous with Jacobinism and Jacobinism was a disease.[219] Alternatively, the Tories cast the Whigs as "apostles of anarchy" setting out to spread insurrection.[220] One article in *The Maga*, entitled the Liberal System, connected several links in a chain of apostasy. First, a revolt or rebellion against rightful authority occurred, and this collected the ignorant around the Whigs. Second, the revolt gave opportunity for the Whigs to hold dinners and committees to gain subscriptions to the new cause—puffing themselves up for their own pleasure. They then perpetrated lies on the people through the stock-market, selling stocks in the name of rebellion. And finally, any time the truth is in danger of coming out, the Whigs needed only to cry out, Liberty!, and nothing could be done to stop them. They were therefore guilty of deception, hypocrisy, embezzlement and fraud, and blatant lying propaganda.[221] Another article, written by Basil Montagu, and republished by *The Pamphleteer* in 1822, exhaustively differentiated between Tory patriots and Whig demagogues.[222] The demagogue was selfish; he opposed the government at all times, lied to the ignorant people, inflamed the people to violence by teaching them equality and original contract, and sold his services to the highest bidder. The consequences of all their sophistry would leave London as

[218] "Remarks on the Principles of the Eclectic Review," 195.
[219] "Burgess's Reflections on the Spirit of the Times," 546, 548.
[220] [Robert Southey], "Parliamentary Reform," 225-226.
[221] "The Liberal System," 444.
[222] Basil Montagu (1770-1851) Lawyer known for his reformation of the bankruptcy laws. Originally a friend of utilitarian William Godwin, he later shifted towards more traditional politics.

desolated as Athens had become—to "convert a living nation into a sepulchre. [sic]"[223] They worshipped man instead of God and thereby, if they ever had their way, would literally kill the nation.[224]

As an interesting addendum to the rhetorical battle, each party was aware that the other was actively twisting the meaning of words. As mentioned in Chapter one, the noun usage of legitimacy came to mean several new things, at least according to the Whigs. A politician could use the term "monsters of Legitimacy" and mean by it, the ministry.[225] An article in *The Edinburgh Review* used the term "Legitimates" and meant both the continental monarchs and their (supposed) supporters in the ministry.[226] Another article equated the "principles of Established Abuse" with "Legitimacy, or Tyranny."[227] Even an adjectival use, with some judicious use of italic type, could turn to the same sarcastic end of ridicule.[228] It was recognizably a new term; it meant a false "Loyalty and Obedience" propagated by the "Sons and Champions of Legitimacy"—the same men who tore away independence from Saxony and Poland and Italy and Spain.[229] The new phrase could therefore be used to describe the Tory press and government as "Legitimates," and instead of meaning right or true, or, in fact, *legitimate,* it meant the exact opposite—i.e. *illegitimate.*

If the Tories could complain about the Whig usage of "Legitimate," the Whigs could complain about the new implications associated with the word "innovation." As an article in *The Westminster Review* stated, through an unhappy coincidence the term innovation had come to

---

[223] Basil Montagu, "Thoughts on the Liberty and The Rights of Englishmen," *The Pamphleteer* 21, no. 40. (1822): 76, 77-78, 79, 81, 91.
[224] "The Faction," 405.
[225] See Chapter One page 24. Anon, "Phillip's Speech at Liverpool," *The British Critic* 7, (1817): 49.
[226] "Foreign Policy of England," 113.
[227] "Dispositions of England and America," 403.
[228] Peter, 218.
[229] Ibid., 220. "Buonaparte and the Elba MS.," 447.

mean bad changes in the minds of men. Even more unhappily, the Tories used the false term to invoke images of anarchy.[230] All the Tories had to do was call something an innovation and it was immediately libeled beyond all repair—even though the Tory ministry had been, according to the Whigs, involved in more changes, perversions, and "innovations" over the last twenty years than ever before.[231] Controlling the definition of a word like innovation gave the Tories a useful tool against reforming arguments. By associating reform with innovation, a word already associated with the French Revolution, the Whigs could be yet again connected to the Revolution.

If the Tories were actively engaged in "alter[ing] the old meaning of words," the Whigs even made the name of Castlereagh into an adjective slur synonymous with despotism and arbitrary abuse. By saying that "Turkey is a country in the last stage of Castlereagh-ery", the Whig author of *The Edinburgh Review* associated a period of English history, the time period when Castlereagh was the foreign minister, with perhaps the most tyrannical government in Europe. On the other hand, when an author in *The Maga* could proudly take upon himself the name of "a bigot, a brute, an illiberal, a foe to freedom, [and] a friend to oppression," it did not literally mean that he was in fact all of those things, rather that he felt that he had "reason to hate" what some have called "liberal ideas."[232] In a battle of rhetoric, even the definition of words became part of the contest.

An author in *The British Critic* summed up what he felt to be the most dangerous trend in contemporary English politics. Normal discussion and argument could face off against other, differing, viewpoints. They were of the same breed, used by men of the same caliber, and when

[230] "Political Fallacies," 419.
[231] "Liberty of the Press and its Abuses," 143.
[232] Anon, "The Illiberal," *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 17, no. 98 (1825): 340.

men employed them, their relative merit could be compared, the weight of their opinion be assessed, and a common course of action decided upon.

> But defamation, and slander, and invective, however they may be despised, under most circumstances, can never be retorted with any effect. Recrimination is the weapon rather of guilt than of innocence; it may fix a stain, but it cannot remove one….It is perfectly plain, that once such a mode of political warfare is permitted in a country, the profligate and unprincipled may walk over the course.[233]

In many ways, recrimination and guilt came to sum up the relations between the two parties. Both the Whigs and the Tories attempted to affix the stain of guilt on each other and, in doing so, on each other's views and beliefs. Each side was relatively successful in doing so—each accumulated about the same amount of mud as the other. In this epic mudslinging conflict, as the author in *The Critic* observed, there were few, if any, hoses going around. And if one party, the Whigs, suddenly found a shovel, any heretofore rhetorical balance between the two parties and their interpretations would be upset. As this work will attempt to show in Chapter three, the Whig party found one such shovel in the Greek Revolution of 1821. Because the environment of political discussion had reached such a fever pitch by the early 1820s, as Chapter two has shown, the interpretation of the English Constitution, exemplified by the two interpretations in Chapter one, was more open to a redefinition. This, however, does not answer the question as to why Greece was more useful to the Whigs than the similar conflicts in Spain and Naples, or other domestic issues in England. Chapter three will attempt to answer this question in order to explain how the Greek Revolution helped the Whigs shift the dominant interpretation of the English Constitution from providential to contractual.

[233] "Burgess's Reflections on the Spirit of the Times," 551-552.

CHAPTER THREE: ᾽EN TOYTΩ NIKA

In March, 1821, the Greek Bishop of Patras, Georgios Yermanos, decided that he had had enough. No longer would he be a stooge of the Turkish government. No longer would he run about at their beck and call. Instead of answering the summons to the nearby Turkish fort, he stopped in the small town of Kalavrita and called the locals together. He promised them victory over their barbaric Muslim oppressors. Greece would again be free. The Greeks must conquer or die. He finished by saying that '"our whole history, and our whole future, are enshrined in the words religion, freedom and fatherland.'"[234] The story, no matter its appeal, is pure fiction written by a rather silly Frenchman.[235] No Greek priest named Yermanos ever spoke them, although it is possible someone spoke words like them over the course of the war. What is more interesting than the veracity of this neat little story is the association made in the end—religion, freedom, and fatherland. This very association was made by the Whig party in England when they rejoiced over the cause of the Greeks.

The Greek Revolution was a *cause célèbre* throughout Europe, not just in England.[236] Almost everyone who had a pulpit, soapbox, or political seat spoke about the Greek Revolution at some point or another—many of them in a favorable light. After all, was it not true that

[234] Brewer, 1-2. The rather silly Frenchman is François Pouqueville, author of *Histoire de la régénération de la Grèce,* who was a rabid supporter of the Greek Cause. As Brewer points out in his work, he is a notoriously inaccurate author.

[235] Ibid., 3.

[236] For more information on Philhellenism at this time, see *That Greece Might Still Be Free* by William St. Clair and *The Philhellenes* by C.M. Woodhouse. As Brewer notes in his bibliography, St. Clair is thoroughly comprehensive when it comes to Philhellenism. He deals with most of the Philhellene movements throughout Europe. See especially pages 51-65. C.M. Woodhouse focuses on several of the lesser known Philhellenes, and his book has also been of use. David Brewer's book forms the backbone of the summation of events in Greece.

Europe owed to Greece its own civilization? Was it not a heartening idea to think of a Greece restored?[237] Many seemed to think so. Early in the conflict, an article published by *The Courier*, the most contentiously Tory of the government-controlled daily newspapers, asked for a subscription for the cause of the Greeks. This author almost immediately retracted his article, however, because the government found his view unacceptable.[238] If the Greek Revolution was appealing even to the Tories, it proved irresistible to the Whigs. Indeed, the Whig party was able to use the Greek Revolution, among other things, as a talisman to further their own ends of social and parliamentary reform which culminated in the Reform bills of the 1830s. Greece, more so than any of the conflicts in Chapter two, made it possible for the Whigs to substantiate the guilt of the Tory ministry and the Tory beliefs. Additionally, the Tories were naturally vulnerable. The Tories could use the fear of revolution as a tool to defend Louis XVIII, for example, against Whig accusations of oriental despotism. When it came to Greece, however, the Tories found themselves having to defend an actual oriental despot over and above the Greeks who, in the eyes of the Whigs and others, were the true descendants of those who first stood against tyranny. It was an untenable position. Nearly a millennium and a half earlier, the Emperor Constantine looked up into the sky and saw the labarum and the words telling him to conquer in that sign. "In this, conquer" was a message the Whigs took up with aplomb, and it was a service that Greece performed admirably.

In order to show the application of Greece within the Whig project of Constitutional redefinition, one must first seek to show certain similarities between the uses of Greece and the uses of other issues and events, such as the Spanish Revolution. As Chapter two demonstrated, both parties sought to associate the other with political positions supposedly incompatible with

[237] Ibid., 135, 138.
[238] Ibid., 140.

the "true" English Constitution of 1688 and the "true" sovereignty, legitimacy, and Christianity which were a part of it. However, as will be shown, there were inherent differences between these other issues and the Greek Revolution. The dissimilarities were what made the Greek Revolution so useful to the Whigs and so damning to the Tories. They were what made possible, in part, a redefinition of the English Constitution—a shift away from the Providentialist view of alienable sovereignty, legal legitimacy, and hierarchical Christianity.

Besides a long held religious resentment, the Greeks had many then-contemporary reasons to hate the Turkish government. Or perhaps reason singular, going by the name of Ali Pasha, is a better description. Ali Pasha was an Albanian who ruled a large portion of Rumelia, or Turkey-in-Europe, in the name of the Sultan.[239] The Ottoman Empire was in reality a loosely organized series of these provinces and sub-provinces whose governors often ruled as virtually independent satraps. Ali Pasha was one of these *ayans* or pashas. He, together with his sons, ruled over most of modern day Albania, Macedonia, and northern Greece or Thrace.[240] They did not rule kindly; Ali's suzerainty over most of Greece was often bloody and violent.[241] By 1820 the Sultan in Constantinople had had enough of Ali and his scheming—often literal schemes to declare independence. From 1820 to 1822 the Sultan fought a war with Ali and his troops to revoke Ali's governorship. This was an important distraction which allowed the Greeks to solidify their hold of certain key regions. Ali Pasha's grand dreams of dynasty and independence had brought immediate stresses into a Greece already holding a deep historic resentment against

[239] For more information about Ali Pasha and his rule, see *The Muslim Bonaparte* by K.E. Fleming. Fleming in his introduction paints a contrast between Ali Pasha as the diplomatic friend of Europe and Ali Pasha as the cultural enemy of Europe. Diplomatic trends had put both Ali Pasha specifically and the Turks in general as the ally to European governments. Cultural trends, however, increasingly cast Ali Pasha as the epitome of the "other," and these trends demanded his destruction. Fleming puts this as one of the main points of his book. K.E. Fleming, *The Muslim Bonaparte* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999), 10.

[240] Ibid., 36-39, Jarrett, 287-289.

[241] Brewer, 40-42.

Ottoman rule, and the Sultan's suppression of Ali's revolt gave breathing room to the revolution when it finally did erupt.

However, the Revolution was also very much a product of the times—closely connected to Enlightenment ideals and partially inspired by the French Revolution.[242] By the middle of the 18th century, Greek translations of Rousseau and Voltaire circulated throughout the wealthy Greek diaspora living abroad in European cities and profiting as wealthy merchants.[243] These men funded a large number of schools in Greece, as well as translations of numerous European works in the sciences and mathematics. Additionally, the Modern Greek language was, for the first time, given comprehensive grammatical rules, and attempts were even made to restore the spoken language to its pristine ancient purity.[244] Two men especially made the Greek Revolution a child of other similar movements in Europe: Adhamantios Korias and Rigas Phereos. Phereos was a poet who, among other things, wrote the hymn of the Revolution. Importantly, the hymn called for a revolution against, not the Turks, but rather, against tyranny. Phereos attempted his revolution too soon, and the Turks captured and executed him in 1798.[245] Korias was a linguist who determined that because education had been the key component in the French Revolution, it would be necessary to first educate Greeks about their ancient heritage before they could successfully throw off the Ottoman yoke.[246] Both men saw in the French Revolution an inspiration for their own countrymen. Both preached about the importance of democracy, popular participation in the formation of government, and the need of a model Greek Constitution. These were all ideas which resonated pleasantly with Whigs in England.

---

[242] For more information on the inspirational connections between the French Revolution and the Greek Revolution, see *The Movement for Greek Independence* edited and translated by Richard Clogg. See especially chapter nine and the documents by Riagas Velestinlis, namely *The Rights of Man (1797)* pages 150-157.

[243] Ibid., 12.

[244] Ibid., 14-15.

[245] Ibid., 17-20.

[246] Ibid., 21-25.

Besides these two prophets of the Revolution, there was a secret society known as the Philiki Eteria, or the Society of Friends, which also partially organized and helped to realize the Revolution. Three members of the Greek Diaspora founded the Society, and they organized it into small cells with various levels of initiation. An evangelist of the organization would enter into a town and initiate a member, who would in turn proselytize in the area. Members were sworn to follow the call and rise up when required. The Society was far from a professional or even a marginally competent organization in reality.[247] However, in the imagination of its members, it seemed to be an impressive entity. Furthermore, the Society did manage to enlist several prominent members abroad, as well as providing some, though not enough, funds for weapons and supplies. Finally, it was the Society which enlisted Alexander Ipsilantis, the leader of the revolt in Romania which sparked the much larger revolt in the Peloponnese.

Firstly, it is important to note that the early stages of the Revolution were extremely bloody. The Greeks killed thousands of Turks—innocent women and children for the most part. The Turks retaliated in the same way. In April of 1821 Turkish soldiers seized the Patriarch in Constantinople, strung him up at his church door, left him to hang there for days, and later had his body dragged ignominiously through the city before dumping it in the sea.[248] This incensed the Greeks. Massacre and counter-massacre became commonplace throughout the conflict—with the worst Greek atrocities happening in Tripolitsa in October of 1821, and the worst, most infamous, Ottoman killings happening at Chios in April of 1822.[249] The massacre of Chios saw nearly the entire population of the island either killed or enslaved; it was well covered in the European presses, and it inspired much horror and dismay. In 1825, after four years of failure,

[247] Ibid., 26-35.
[248] Jarrett, 295.
[249] Ibid., 303, Brewer, 157.

the Sultan invited his most powerful, nominally subservient satrap, Mehemet Ali of Egypt, to help him put down the Greeks in return for land in Greece. Ali and the Sultan planned on exterminating the Greeks and repopulating the entire peninsula with loyal Muslims. The discovery of this plan by the European governments inspired a chain of events which finally brought direct intervention from the European powers. In 1827 in the Treaty of London, Russia, England, and France agreed to force a settlement of the conflict. The recalcitrant Sultan, finally seeing results with the help of Ali's armies, refused to negotiate. The Battle of Navarino in October of 1827 destroyed the navy of the Ottomans and the Egyptians, putting an end to Egyptian reinforcements and the last hope of the Ottomans to reconquer their rebellious provinces. A small, but entirely independent Greece emerged in 1830.[250]

This brief summation of the Greek Revolution in no way conveys the complexities of the conflict in Greece itself. At various points the Greeks were engaged in an open civil war against each other. Any and all attempts to form a centralized government were dismal failures on the ground in Greece—although a provisional government was more successful in convincing Europe of its validity. [251] It does not communicate the cosmopolitan aspects of the war. Numerous Europeans came and fought for the Greeks, including Italian and Spanish expatriates from the Neapolitan and Spanish revolutions.[252] Nor, as a final note, does it mention the London Greek Committee which successfully floated a Greek loan to the tune of nearly half a million pounds—irresponsibly used, as it later turned out, by the Greeks in their civil war.[253] Knowing some of these events, however, will help one understand how Greece affected the rhetorical conflict at home in England.

[250] Jarrett, 346-348.
[251] Stites, 216-217, 221.
[252] Ibid., 225-237.
[253] Brewer, 222-223, 289.

The Whig press, in much the same way that it used the issue of the Bourbon Restoration or the Spanish Revolution, set out to use the Greek Revolution to prove that the Tory government, the Tory party in general, and its interpretation of the Constitution, specifically, was a dangerous threat to the freedom and peace of the English people. The Tory press countered by attempting to prove how the Whig supporters of the Greek Revolution meant to undermine the English Constitution by using the same ideas and principles which had caused the revolution in France. According to the Tories, the Greek Revolution represented the same revolutionary action as that of the French, and later the Spanish and Neapolitan revolutions. An Englishman supporting these types of actions abroad would also incontrovertibly support them at home. If this were allowed, the inevitable, terrible consequences of disorder and irreligion would then destroy all that was good about the English way of life.

From the beginning, however, the particular context of the Greek Revolution gave the Whigs an advantage and the Tories a disadvantage. The Whig press found extra advantage in both the Classical and Christian aspects of the Greek conflict—that is, Greece the classical land of all freedom and intelligence, a land and a people to which the Europeans owed a debt, and Greece the land of Christians fighting a war of survival against heretical Muslims. The Tory press, in addition to proving the danger and illegitimacy of the Greek Revolution, had to prove the Greeks were not Christians or that the conflict was not religious, and they had to prove that Europe did not owe the Greeks any "classical" debt. This amounted to arguing against both the fact that the Greeks were Christian and against centuries of European philhellenism.

As will be shown, this was an additional message impossible to coherently sustain, and the Tories failed to maintain their doctrine in the face of it. For the Tories it meant literally defending an oriental despotism with their own ideals of sovereignty and legitimacy and this, in

turn, polluted their own stance. It was one thing to argue that the French Revolution and the Revolution of 1688 were different and therefore maintain the illegality of the French Revolution. It was one thing to argue that the Whigs, in engendering constitutional reform, meant to destroy the Constitution or to argue that the Spanish Revolution was directly inspired by the French Revolution and could therefore not be supported. It was another thing to doctrinally compare the French Revolution and the Greek Revolution because that would practically mean supporting a Muslim government against a Christian people, a barbarian race against a civilized nation, the inhuman cause of arbitrary rule against the human cause of freedom. It might perhaps even implicate the idea of occidental superiority. The Tories did try to carry their doctrine through, but even they faltered at its practical application—and if the Tories faltered, the Whigs had a field day.

In order to show this, the work will analyze the ways in which the Whigs used Greece to prove the guilt of their Tory adversaries, including the specific advantages the Whigs were able to bring to the forefront when using Greece—namely the classical and Christian aspects of the conflict. After this, the work will turn to the arguments of the Tory press—that is, the ways in which the Tories attempted to prove the illegality of the Greek conflict, its connections with the French Revolution, and how the Whigs, in associating themselves and England with it, were putting the country in danger. The additional burdens the Tories had to deal with in the Greek conflict will follow. In some ways, the Tory press mounted a brilliant and subversive counter-attack against Whig rhetoric; however, as the final section will attempt to show, Tory doctrine fell flat when it faced a practical application. It might seem to be a drawn-out and tenuous connection. However, if, as Chapter one has tried to show, the Tories understood Christianity to be a fundamental part of the established order and the established Constitution, then any political

event which made it difficult for them to rhetorically sustain their version of Christianity also weakened their version of sovereignty and legitimacy. In this way, the Greek Revolution helped to shift the dominant interpretation of the English Constitution away from a Providentialist understanding and towards a Contractual understanding.

In an article published in *The Pamphleteer*, a purported conversation between Castlereagh and a member of parliament gives some insight into the ways the Whig members of that body immediately attempted to use Greece. James Mackintosh, M.P., upon hearing the news of the Chios massacres, asked Castlereagh if any of those murdered had been under the protection of the English government. Additionally he asked if any of the recent dispatches which "the Noble Marquis" had received told of the filled slave markets of Constantinople where Christian ladies were being sold en masse to rapacious Turkish masters. Could the ministers give Parliament any account of the new slave trade "recently established in the east, for amiable and accomplished Christian females, by a government which was encouraged and supported by the administration of this free and enlightened country"? Castlereagh responded by commenting that "the question of the honorable and learned gentlemen involved an argument as well as a question," and that it would have to wait until a different time. This conversation is not recorded in Hansard, the British Parliamentary records, and is credited as being reprinted from *The Courier*, a government newspaper. No matter its veracity, it is a useful representation of the difficulties Castlereagh and the government faced both in Parliament and in the wider world of the Whig press. The supposed connection between the English and Turkish governments inspired a great deal of Whig invective against the government.[254]

[254] Hughes, "An Address to the People of England in the Cause of the Greeks," 2-4.

For over a year, wrote an author in *The Edinburgh Review*, the Greeks had been fighting for their freedom against the "most austere and insolent task-masters that…ever yet vexed and tormented any portion of mankind." England had not even once attempted to help the Greeks in their struggle against despotism. England had once bravely helped the Dutch in their war against tyrannical Spain and Austria: she had then fought for liberty. Now she dared not act in the name of freedom.[255] Rather, with the "mask of an ill-disguised neutrality," the English government had decided to help the Turk suppress and slaughter innocents in Greece.[256] That is, England had "delivered Christian descendants of Greeks to the whips and scourges of infidel Barbarians." This was the result of the legitimacy of thrones. Did the prescriptive powers of law also run in favor of the Turks whose government was "theoretically and practically vicious"? One could lament, went on the author, that the former glory of England had so drastically disappeared. The

[255] This article, entitled Demosthenes, is almost entirely a literary review of a new French translation of the famous speeches Demosthenes gave to the Athenians, urging them to join other Greek city states in the war against Phillip II of Macedonia. It is interesting to note two things. Firstly, the author of the article in the *Edinburgh Review* spends the first several pages of his work both praising ancient mannerists and lamenting the imperfectability of translation. Demosthenes ends this section as the most perfect of the ancient rhetoricians. The author concludes his the introduction on page 489 by saying that the Declaration of the Athenians is a document not "surpassed by any that has come after it, during the lapse of two thousand years, in wisdom, dignity, and eloquence." Such praise by the author in *The Edinburgh Review* is not a coincidence. Demosthenes, a man who urged every effort in the fight against tyranny in the form of Phillip II, is rhetorically called forth again to do battle against not only the tyranny of a reborn Persian empire in the form of Ottoman Turkey but also the complicity of those in England who, like the pacifying Greeks Demosthenes argued against, would ignore the dangers of tyranny on the continent and even in the highest ranks of the English government. Secondly, it is interesting to note the disgust the author of the review evinces against the author of the new French translation. The weakness of the translation extends entirely, in the mind of the reviewer, to dilutions of Demosthenes' attacks against the sins of Phillip. The author of the French translation waters-down the proof of Demosthenes' "superhuman high-mindedness and devotion" to Greek ideals of democracy. In France it seems, and in England as the author later states, there has been a purposeful dilution of the purity of Ancient Greek language and ideals—which, when combined with the then current political comments which end the article seen above in the main body, add a great deal of rhetorical weight to the connections which the Whig author is making.

[256] Anon, "Demosthenes," *The Edinburgh Review* 36, no. 72 (1822): 514-515. These allegations could possibly refer to the events early in the Revolution which placed the British governor of the Ionian Islands, Thomas Maitland, in a difficult situation. For example, an early rebellion in the town of Patras, situated on the Peloponnese near the Ionian Islands, was brutally suppressed by the Turks. The "silly Frenchman" of the opening paragraphs of this chapter was present on one of the Islands, and he bitterly complained about supposed English complicity in the actions of the Turks. Philip Green, an Englishman in charge of a local consulate, denied any partiality against the Greeks and towards the Turks, but he is still remembered in Greek Historiography as an infamous character. For more information on this story, see The Greek War of Independence, pages 72-78.

Greek cause was the cause of "Liberty and Religion," and England had a duty to step up and support it.[257] This article followed the general course of casting guilt upon the government for failing to live up to a "true" Englishness, represented here by that spirit which had inspired Elizabeth to help the Dutch in the Eighty Years War. Not only had the ministry failed in this, they had gone over to the opposite extreme and actively helped the Turks kill and destroy a people fighting to change their arbitrary government. For the author, it was the Greeks' attempt to change their government which inspired the ministry to turn against them. "The very insinuation of such a change—though according to safe and glorious example…fills them [the governments] at once with animosity and terror."[258] A safe and glorious example? Namely the Revolution of 1688. The insinuation was, that instead of helping the Greeks achieve the same act which the English had first successfully done for themselves, the government was trying to stop them. In addition to this, there was another sub-text floating about in this article. How could it be that legal prescription could run in favor of barbarian Muslims over Christians? Christians who were descended from the Greeks no less! For this author, not only was there something special about the Greeks—both Christians and innate legacies of the classical age—there was also something worse about the Turks. He concluded that the "immortality of Greece" could be England's to have if only the nation would break through these chimerical obstacles and save the Greeks.

Another article published in *The Edinburgh Review* approached the subject of Greece and the guilt of England through a review of a book published by Sir William Gell.[259] Gell published

[257] Ibid., 515-516.
[258] Ibid., 515.
[259] Sir William Gell. (1777-1836) Classicalist and scholar. Traveled a great deal in the eastern Mediterranean and published several books about his journeys, including *Narrative of a Journey in the Morea* in 1823. He was the first author to publish archeological treatises on Pompeii in English, and he also contributed to the then nascent field of English Egyptology.

his as a recounting of the present state of Greece. However, the reviewer immediately took great umbrage with the fact that Gell published as contemporary a travel narrative he actually wrote in 1804—"just nineteen years ago!!" After some speculation as to why Gell decided to publish his work, the reviewer concluded that the book was "evidently sent forth as a torpedo, to paralyze all sympathy with suffering, and all admiration for heroism."[260] The "venom…shot against the spirit of Liberty" was disheartening to see in a man who supposedly could claim to be an Englishman—although it was doubtful if Gell ought to be able, any longer, to so describe himself. He gloried in a hatred of liberty; he made light of the terrible Turkish government; and he attacked the so-called "*mad assertion of worthless rights*" which the Greeks engaged to attain.[261] Combining these attacks against the doctrine of Gell, the reviewer often asserted throughout the work how un-English Gell was. The author, in apologizing for Gell, essentially asserted that his views were not true English views—and, contrariwise, that a true Englishman would instead try to help the Greeks and their cause, just as all Englishmen ought to have helped Belgium, given to the Netherlands; Saxony, given to Prussia; Genoa, given to Savoy; and Norway, given to Sweden. Thus, the reviewer connected Greece to all the other so-called acts of rapine committed over the previous few years at the Congress of Vienna and after.[262]

Again however, there was more to the attack. According to the reviewer, Gell wrote his little book as an attack against the cause of the Greeks as representing both "Freedom and Christianity."[263] Having proved, so the reviewer felt, that Gell had no right to comment upon any

[260] Anon, "Sir William Gell's Greece," *The Edinburgh Review* 38, no. 76 (1823): 316.

[261] Ibid., 316-318. It is interesting to note that, after an investigation of the context in which this quote was found in Gell's work, it is apparent that the reviewer did little justice to Gell. See Sir William Gell, *Narrative of a Journey in the Morea* (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees Orme, and Brown, 1823), 218-219.

[262] Ibid., 318-320.

[263] Ibid., 316, 320.

subject related to liberty, he went on to prove that Gell had no right to comment on anything Christian. "We [the reviewer] cannot speak with too much reprobation of the unfair and illiberal method in which he pursues his object of aggravating the faults of the Christians, and extenuating those of the [Muslims].[264] Supposedly, Gell claimed that the Greeks were not Christian, that the Muslims were Christian in all but name; he claimed the Greeks killed more ferociously than the Turks; he gloried in comparing the ignorance of Greek Orthodoxy to the perversions of the Catholic Church."[265] However, as the reviewer pointed out, all of this was untrue. The Greeks were "fighting in *a religious war*" and they suffered "only because they [chose] to worship their Saviour [sic] [emphasis in the original]."[266] Furthermore, the Greeks—as could be seen in their Constitution[267]—were more tolerant to all types of religious faiths than other forms of Christianity which preached "*toleration"* and *"indulgence."*[268]

The reviewer also pointed out that Gell spent a great deal of time attempting to establish that the modern Greeks were no true descendants of the ancient Greeks. Gell complained bitterly about the entitlement of the modern Greeks who thought they could claim respect based on their "ancient superiority."[269] However, as the reviewer pointed out eagerly, "by such reasoning…

---

[264] Ibid., 327.

[265] Ibid., 326-327, 331.

[266] Ibid., 327.

[267] The Greek Constitutional Convention assembled at Epídhavros in late 1821. It recognized the Orthodox religion as the State religion. It provided for the protection of civil rights. It also provided three distinct branches of government. The Senate, elected yearly was a unicameral body meant to pass laws. The Executive was a body of five members; they were appointed by the constitutional convention itself. The Executive, in turn appointed a council of eight ministers—these men ran the different departments of the state like finance and foreign diplomacy. The Senate and the Executive could each veto the decisions of the other. There was also an appointment for a Judiciary, which never really materialized during the height of the war—things were always far too complicated. All of this was provisional; it was meant to last only for a year. See Brewer, *The Greek War of Independence* pages 128-134. A year later, the Greeks met to revise certain aspects of the Constitution. Several amendments gave more power to the Senate over and above the Executive. These amendments and the reaction to them, in part, inspired the Greek Civil War which began in 1824. Roughly, each side of the conflict followed either the Executive or the Senate. See Brewer, *The Greek War of Independence* pages 181-193.

[268] Ibid., 329. An obvious reference to the Toleration and Indulgence acts of England.

[269] Ibid., 324.

every nation in Europe might be proved to be—not itself"![270] Gell's book was only useful as a guidebook to theater owners who could find in its pages admirable descriptions of eastern clothing.[271] Again, beyond implying the un-Englishness of all men who agreed with Gell, the article used the weight of Greece—both religiously and classically—to impugn the honor of any who might argue that the cause of the Greeks was not an inherently English cause—the cause of liberty and Christianity—the cause of 1688. The fight of the Greeks represented the true principles of the English Constitution.

An article published in *The Westminster Review* attempted to show the differences between the Greek Revolution and the other supposed revolutionary upheavals throughout Europe. The European powers, England included, had mistaken "the accidental or insurrectional" revolution with the "national or constitutional" revolution. The beginning of the Revolution, when Ipsilantis had crossed into the Rumanian provinces and began his ill-fated attempt to incite a great general rebellion, had been an example of an insurrectionary revolution. The second rebellion, beginning in the Peloponnese, was the national or constitutional rebellion. There was an "absence of all connexion [sic] between the Greek revolt" and the other revolutions in Western Europe.[272] And yet the so-called "Holy" Alliance had done nothing for the Christians of Greece. This proved beyond all doubt that "the cause of all sovereigns right or wrong, against all subjects, is the real bond of the Holy Alliance."[273] If England did not finally stand up and oppose this alliance against all freedom, if England did not recognize the Greeks in their struggle, then the English would soon be chained to the same bonds as all the other subjects of the world. The

[270] Ibid., 325.
[271] Ibid., 332.
[272] Anon, "Greece and Russia," *Greece and Russia* 1, no. 2 (1824): 464-465.
[273] Ibid., 469-470.

duty of England was to "side with free institutions."[274] One thing often stood in the way, however. The English church, instead of showing their Christian generosity to fellow Christians, had refused to give to the Greek cause. The dissenting Christian denominations had given much more money to help the Greeks. What did this say about supposed English Christians? It said nothing good.[275] Again, the unique Christian aspects of the conflict gave this article's author additional leverage. "The crimes of Turkey and the rights of Greece" were "moral truisms," and when the Church of England could be shown deficient in supporting Greece, it cast doubt on the very Christianity of the Anglican Church.

Another article in *The Westminster* also celebrated those dissenting Christians who gave money and supplies to Greece, especially the Quakers. Additionally, the article noted the numerous successes of continental subscriptions to help Greece. "Even in obscure villages sermons had been preached…in favor of 'Christians fighting the battles of the cross' and of patriots contending for liberty." [276] It did not speak well of England, the supposed land of liberty, that she did not give as much to Greece as the Swiss or the Germans. It did not speak well of English Christianity, namely the state sponsored Christianity of Anglicanism, that Quakers and Catholics abroad cared more for the Greeks than they.

Two tracts published in *The Pamphleteer* furthered the implications of these arguments. The first, by the Reverend T.S. Hughes, began in a familiar way by connecting the policies of the English government together with the policies of the continental monarchs. The Balance of Power, and other like terms of obfuscation such as the "peace of Europe," were nothing more than terms meant to hide the truth of what was really going on. England had once been a nation

[274] Ibid., 470-471.
[275] Ibid., 468-469.
[276] Anon, "Greek Committee," *The Westminster Review* 6, no. 11 (1826): 114-115.

which fought for the freedom of all peoples. Now there were, according to Hughes, Englishmen serving in the Turkish army and navy, and they were helping kill Greek people.[277] Why were they doing this? Because the English government had decided that the Turkish government had a legal, legitimate right to rule over the Greeks and because the English government feared spreading insurrectionary ideals over Europe. But this was a wrongheaded idea according to Rev. Hughes. The Greeks owed no allegiance to the Turks. Firstly, the Turks regarded no laws of their own as inviolable. Everything was arbitrary. Personal property could be seized on a whim. Secondly, the Greeks owed the Turks no fealty because the Turks had never once proved their right to rule by providing the Greeks benefits. That is, the ideal of a feudal, monarchical bond between king and subject had never existed between the Turks and the Greeks because the Turks had never provided benefit of protection to the Greeks.[278] Essentially, there could not be a legal legitimacy because the Turks never established laws of governance. In the absence of legal legitimacy, there could only be the legitimacy of consent. As Hughes put it:

> "unattached…by a single benefit, not acknowledging their odious dominion, unbound by a single oath, unrestrained by any bond but that of terror," the Greeks had therefore never "renounced the imprescriptible law of national independence, they retain the…right to rise against their ferocious tyrants…. To denounce their

[277] Thomas Hughes, "An Address to the People of England in the Cause of the Greeks," *The Pamphleteer* 21, no. 41 (1822): 171.

[278] In much the same way, the Whigs made arguments against the tyranny of the restored Bourbon Monarchy. To the Whigs the Bourbon monarchy was just another oriental despotism whose sin co-mingled with the sin of the Tory ministry which kept Louis XVIII in power with an English army. For more on the connections between the Bourbon monarchy and the Orientalist Turks in taste and dress, see Ina McCabe, *Orientalism in Early Modern France: Eurasian Trade, Exoticism, and the Ancien Régime* (Oxford: Berg, 2008). In her Epilogue, McCabe makes interesting observations on the effort of the Revolutionary French government to purify the land of oriental silks and aristocratic fashions. It did not matter that these silks and fashions were far more French than they had ever been oriental. Louis XVIII and especially his brother Charles X both specifically sought to emulate the style of the former monarchy. A restoration of aristocratic silk also restored a perception of oriental decadence and tyranny.

> patriotic struggles for the recovery of those rights on which alone legitimacy is founded, as the efforts of rebellion, is political blasphemy, is an outrage against…the law of nature."[279]

Here Hughes quickly moved from an attack against Tory legitimacy towards a justification of Whig sovereignty and Whig legitimacy. Tories argued that the Greeks, as subjects of the Muslim Turks had no right to rebel. They had alienated those rights, in essence. Hughes countered and said instead that the Greeks never alienated any rights because they never agreed to the rule of the Turks. The Turks, additionally, had never proven their legal right to rule because they had never provided the services they were, as rulers, supposed to provide. Even the Tories acknowledged that the contract of government went both ways. Because of these two things, the Greeks retained the right to rebel against the Turks. Furthermore, Hughes went further and argued that legitimacy always had to be founded on the rights of the people to agree or disagree with the policies of the government.

These arguments, as useful as they were, however, were only the beginning of Hughes' attempts to undermine Tory doctrine through Greece. In his own words, "I would excite that ardour [sic] and enthusiasm in the breasts of my countrymen which may lead them to express openly their sentiments….the *vox populi* has been sometimes rather impiously denominated the *vox dei*: in this instance, however, it might deserve the appellation."[280] The cause of the Greeks was a Christian cause, and, trusting that the English spirit was not yet dead, Rev. Hughes hoped to excite his fellows to vindicate true Christianity and, putting to shame "the character of the Government abroad," expunge from Europe the tyrannical Turks.[281] Greece was the land of the

[279] Hughes, "An Address to the People of England in the Cause of the Greeks," 180-181.
[280] Hughes, "An Address to the People of England in the Cause of the Greeks," 171.
[281] Ibid., 171-172.

ancients, where Aristotle and Plato had bestowed their works to the world, and where St. Paul had preached the word of Christ. It was the land of Thermopylae and Salamis, and more than that, Greece was currently the land of "suffering Christians." Hughes called for a new religious war to vindicate Christianity, restore the government of England to the place it ought to occupy internationally, and save Christians from Muslims.[282] There was need of a new Crusade, it seemed, this one intentionally directed at Constantinople. Hughes efficiently used Greece to prove the Whig idea of sovereignty and legitimacy were closer to the truth than the views of the Tory government. By connecting the Greek struggle to a new religious holy war, Hughes pushed home an advantage. His vituperation of the Turks and his commendation of the Greeks as a classical and Christian people added a new level of rhetorical force to Whig constitutional interpretation. Here, in the Greek Revolution, was literally a war for liberty and religion. The stakes had never been higher: "the struggle is between oppression, tyranny, and injustice arrayed against humanity, civilization, and Christianity." Let anyone who opposed this cause of truth, he prayed, be "extirpated."[283]

In the same volume of *The Pamphleteer*, another tract, by Edmund Henry Barker, responded directly to T.S. Hughes' publication. Mr. Barker took pride in having early recognized the religious nature of the conflict. What was more interesting to him, however, was the twaddle currently on display in the House of Lords. A bill meaning to admit Catholic members into Parliament had "stir[red] up…zeal into vigorous action, but…when a Christian population of seven million souls" could be shown to be struggling for political, religious and civil freedoms—indeed for their very lives—it inspired no action.[284] What kind of Christianity was this, asked

[282] Ibid., 172.
[283] Hughes, "An Address to the People of England in the Cause of the Greeks," 184.
[284] Barker, 191.

Mr. Barker. It was the wrong type of Christianity, one which told the English people that they had no responsibility towards the Greeks because the Greeks were mere rebels.[285] This was what the Tory newspapers said. However, if as Lord Coke had said '"that Christianity is part and parcel of the common law of the land'" then, said Mr Barker, all Englishmen had a right to demand that their government take action in favor of the Greeks.[286] Barker then went on to develop the connection between the law of the land and Christianity. Lord Coke had been a famous English lawyer of the seventeenth century, most well-known for his connection between the structure of the English government—as codified in the common law—and the Church of England. By invoking his name, Barker turned the arguments of the Tories against them.[287] For if the government legally required its subjects to act in accordance with Christian teaching, then how could the government not legally be required to follow the precepts of the law of the land? Barker extrapolated:

> A publican was…recently tried for and convicted of the offence of refusing to receive into his house a person, who had fallen into the Thames, and had been rescued from a watery grave; and it was, I think, argued in the Court, not so much that his house should have been opened to the reception of the sufferer, because it was licensed for the public accommodation, as that the law of humanity is anterior to all positive law, because it is a part of Christianity, which is part and parcel of

[285] Ibid., 201.

[286] Barker, 195. Edward Coke (1552-1634) was lawyer and politician. He became famous during the reigns of Elizabeth and James I. He became attorney general early in the 1600s. His role in shaping the common law of England is hard to overestimate. According to Coke, the common law of England had long existed before William the Conqueror, indeed, even before the Romans. As such, Coke's conclusions and legal treatises became bones of contention in and of their own right.

[287] See *English Society* by J.C.D. Clark, pages 492-494. Coke's precepts were used in 1819 in the trial of Richard Carlile after he had published Paine's *Age of Reason*. The Courts convicted Carlile of Blasphemous Libel and he remained in jail until 1825, in no small part because of Coke's precepts connecting the security of the state to orthodox Anglican doctrine and teaching.

> the common law of the land. Now if an individual is in such a case and on such grounds liable to punishment for not following the precepts of our holy religion, surely no man will deny the obligation of those, who are intrusted [sic] with the administration of the country, to regulate its policy by those precepts—no man will dispute the criminality of those, who have adhered to a different system.[288]

Here Barker argued that because Coke established Christianity as part of the common law of the nation, the Courts could convict the man in question of a violation not of the positive law of the land but a violation of an "anterior" law of humanity—closely related to Christianity. This is not using Christian precepts to support the common law, as Coke had been interpreted to do before, but rather to establish the law of humanity as something coming first in time and importance—*before* the prescriptive common law of Burke, thereby establishing, in essence, a higher court of appeal. In this higher court the actions of a government as well as a man could be found wanting; they could be criminal and therefore the government could be criminal.

Barker went on to show how the government's action concerning Greece proved their criminality. Following Burke, the government maintained that man, when he entered into a government, set aside forever the "claims of *nature."* However, according to this system, the subjects of a tyrannical government would forever be bound to the "chains of despotism" and never see "emancipation or improvement."[289] Tories used the authority of the Bible to accomplish this, saying that the powers that be are ordained of God. Whigs countered by observing that God made the Sabbath for man, not man for the Sabbath. That is, God had made governments for man, not the other way around.[290] Saying anything else was patent nonsense.

[288] Barker, 195.
[289] Barker, 199.
[290] Barker, 199-200.

Using these arguments, Mr. Barker was able to make a damming pronouncement in favor of the Greek Revolution:

> I shall not deny, that any writers are at full liberty to denominate the Greeks *Rebels*, when they have answered the questions, whether the Barons at Runnamede [sic] were or were not *Rebels*, whether the Reformation was or was not a *Rebellion* against the Church of Rome, whether Jesus Christ, who overturned the religion of the Jews, was or was not a traitor to his country and a *Rebel* against the Roman Empire. [emphasis in original] [291]

Here then, was the final connection. England and Greece were the same. Their fights were the same. The conflict in which Greece was then engaged had already seen its conclusions in England. It had begun with the signing of the Maga Charta and ended in 1688 with the deposition of James II. Far from being a rebellion against legal authority, the Greeks fought for the rights the Bible and the true Christian religion essentially gave to them and to all other people. The Greek conflict proved useful indeed because abnormal aspects of the conflict—the religious sub-text combined with the powerful image of a literal oriental despotism—made it easy to make absurd Tory doctrine and practice, which, in the words of Mr. Barker, would have made Christ a rebel and would have seen him strung up at the yardarm.

Greece was the mother of freedom, the classical land of civilization. Her annals offered to the world the first noble progress of human kind. She did not just exist in history, however. She offered a living lesson to all nations in the then contemporary world.[292] An author writing in *The Edinburgh Review* looked forward to a day when small city-state-like nations might return to the world. Just like Greece, the new nations might join in a mighty confederacy and protect the

[291] Barker, 198.
[292] Anon, "Politics of Switzerland," *The Edinburgh Review* 37 no. 73 (1822): 141, 168.

liberties of all. Perhaps the small state of Switzerland could be the seed of a new group of such nations. "We could dream…that a belt of Mountain Republics, worthy of their ancient glory, might extend from Basle to Byzantium, from the Rhine to the Hellespont—supported by England, the power most interested in their welfare, and most able to assist them in the maintenance of their freedom." This new…"entity," for state does not seem quite right, would, in the words of the author, guard the world against Russian, Austrian, and French tyranny. All peoples living in it could rejoice in their own worship, traditions, and laws. They would be "united only by one common interest, beneficial to all, and injurious to none,—the interest of their common freedom."[293] Here also was another powerful appeal of Greece, that of the glory of her history, fictive yet real. One need only imagine the horror this dream might have inspired in the minds of the Austrian government. It seems geographically impossible to have a string of little republican states from Basil to Constantinople without thoroughly redistributing sovereign lands of the Austrian crown. Furthermore, to the Tory government, the call upon England to participate in this republican dream could have only seemed a new revolutionary terror born again. The Whig usage of Greece was threatening to the extreme. Christian Greece and Classical Greece had an undeniable pull. No matter the additional weight these two themes added to Whig arguments, the Tory press responded; it attempted to prove, as it had done before with other issues, that the Whig ideals expressed through Greece threatened the English Constitution. Tory authors also set out to deal with the special problems Greece evoked. The dominant interpretation of the English Constitution depended, in part, on their ability to meet the challenge.

[293] Ibid., 164.

An author writing for *The British Critic* bitterly complained that the opposition party had taken up the cause of the Greeks as a "watchword of a faction." Any person at home in England, no matter their real opinions on the subject of Greek independence had to choose between supporting Greece and the Whigs, or not supporting the Whigs and therefore not supporting Greece. Any man who presumed to think that perhaps the Greek Revolution was not a proper fight for the English to take, or that perhaps Greece ought to be more circumspect in their fight for freedom was immediately "branded with the imputation of political slavishness, or sneered at as the advocate of 'legitimacy' and the 'Holy Alliance.'"[294] What was the effect of all of this? It was to dangerously limit the actions and beliefs to which any one person could adhere. A man's views on the Greek conflict equaled the "criterion of his political partialities" in England. "Country gentlemen refused to subscribe to Greece, from a fear of being confounded with the reformers." Greece was the cause of reform, of utilitarian radicals, of religious fanatics who wanted to separate Church and State entirely, and of believers in equal voting rights. These were the causes of those men who wanted to change and thereby destroy England.[295] The way these men cast the necessity of English participation in this so called constitutional cause betrayed their own ignorance about the true English way of life. Furthermore, the anger and frustration evinced in this article against those who so used Greece exemplified some of the additional rhetorical weights of Greece. A person might want to help Greece while at the same time opposing reform at home, but because of the open and vocal methods in which the Whig party and their more radical friends used Greece, this was impossible. As a consequence, no matter how unfair the imputation might be, one found oneself a supporter of slavish policies and the tyranny of the Holy Alliance.

[294] Anon, "Greece," *The British Critic* 23, (1825): 1-2.
[295] "Greece," 2.

An author writing in *The Maga* wrote that the Greek cause was being used in an attempt to make the English "abdicate sovereignty" and to force all the true Christians in England, Scotland, and Ireland to "leave the three kingdoms a free and perpetual heritage to the Dissenters, the Anti-burghers and the Papists." The Greeks were in open and active rebellion against their legitimate sovereign, the Sultan. Profligate fools in England attempted to argue for interference in favor of the Greeks and their open rebellion. Just as in England, the Sultan had a right to punish traitors. "With what grace, then, or propriety, or policy, or fitness… can any government interfere; for to ask another not to oppose a rebellion, would be to declare at once for the rebels."[296] This was the abdication of sovereignty which the Whigs were attempting to enforce in the Greek cause. They tried to say that it was not a rebellion and hide the fact that they were asking the English government to support the right of rebellion. If the government did support this right for the Greeks, then what was to prevent the French from inciting and helping the Irish in a rebellion against England, or the Indians in a revolt against the East India Company? No principle would stand in the way of this. Here indeed then, was a Tory print arguing on the principle of legal legitimacy against the Greek Cause and in favor of the Turkish government.

Another article in *The Maga* furthered these arguments. The Greek Committee, the organization which had secured publically financed loans for the provisional Greek government, had also engaged to provide weapons and materials of war for the Greeks. This had gone far enough. In principle, how was the Greek Committee not essentially committing acts of war against the Turks under the nose of the English government? England and the Ottomans were open friends and allies; the difference in principle between the two nations mattered not a whit.

[296] Anon, "The Greeks and the Greek Cause," *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 12, no. 69 (1822): 472.

The ministry had refused to help the Greeks in their rebellion because the Turkish government was an ally of the English. So what was going on was that "a set of private individuals…[were] assembling periodically in a London tavern, and gravely discussing the propriety of sending 'Congreve rockets,' 'spherical case-shot,' 'skillful partizans,' [sic] and 'other acceptable offerings to the struggling Greeks.'"[297] How was this not a war between the private subjects of the English crown and the Ottoman government? The Greek Committee had no right to act as they were acting. If they did, then so too would a similar committee in France be able to dissimulate on the sending of weapons to the Irish and set up their own private war against the government of England.

> In a word, the question just comes to be this: is it not still the prerogative of GOVERNMENTS to form treaties of peace, and to declare and carry on war? Or is it really so, that all these 'old things have passed away,'—that the departments of governments and subjects have been changed in the European world?

Thus *The Maga* drew the lines. The Greek Committee and the men who subscribed to it were taking upon themselves, as a right, something which belonged entirely to the wise and considered judgment of an established government. The Greek cause, romantic and appealing, was really being used to subvert the very principle of government according to the Tories. Who gave the individual subject of England the right to discuss and judge in these matters? If any one man did have the right to make these decisions and take these actions, then there might as well not be any government at all.[298]

[297] Anon, "Mr. Blaquierre's Report on Greece &c," 14, no. 81 (1823): 465.
[298] Ibid., 466.

Greece was a key part of the attacks of the Whigs and their "Liberal System," in the words of another article published in *The Maga*. The "Statesmen of Cockaigne" set out to change and destroy all sovereignty and government.[299] These supposed statesmen supported Greece, Spain, and Naples in their revolutionary attempts. Whenever a revolt against legally constituted authority happened, they lauded it to the skies; they rallied around it. All they thought a government needed was an enthusiastic love of liberty, to change the name of the king to a president, and to throw a constitution together. They did not understand the true principle of government. They shouted the name of Greece and Liberty and, according to them, "not to join in it, was regarded to be little better than treason against our own freedom."[300] According to the author of this particular article, if, as the Statesmen of Cockaigne said, the English Constitution was founded upon their ideas, then all was well and good. England ought to help the Greeks. But if it was not, then what the Statesmen were doing was "digging away the foundations" of the English nation, and no one was trying to stop them.[301] So, just with other similar issues, the Tories were able to associate the supporters of Greece with the same Jacobin principles of the French Revolution and to argue that the English Constitution was not founded on any recognition of rights or extension of liberty.[302] The Whigs were using Greece to undermine the Constitution. The Tories believed they had to be stopped.

However, these articles had to serve double duty, so to speak. This self-same article, writing against the Whigs, had also to establish the unworthiness of the Greeks as a people. They were without money and ability; they were unable to agree and unify against a common enemy;

---

[299] The Land of Cockaigne was the European Medieval equivalent of Shangri-La. It was a land of perfect plenty, never-ending food, limitless possibilities. Sex was free; youth was eternal; and work was forbidden. For more information, see Herman Pleij, *Dreaming of Cockaigne: Medieval Fantasies of the Perfect Life* trans. Diane Webb (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), 3-5 and passim.

[300] "The Liberal System," 442-444.

[301] Ibid., 453-454.

[302] Ibid., 451-452.

and they were "among the most ignorant and depraved of God's creatures." Regarding their intelligence, the Greeks were about equal to the slave found in Barbados, and their moral fiber fell fall short of even that modest goal. Yes, the Turkish government left much to be desired, but the Greeks were not capable of taking up their own freedom and governance. They were depraved and debased—unworthy of English help.[303] Again and again Tory prints had to find a way to deal with the Whig prognostications in favor of Classical Greece and Christian Greece.

The simplest way to do this was to cast the Greeks as unchristian and in no way related to their ancient ancestors. When, for instance, had the degradation of the Greeks begun? The Gibbonian approach could be successfully posited. Anyone who had read Gibbon's work knew that the fall of the Greeks really began when the Romans in the east fell under the sway of northern barbarians. Then was their learning lost, and then was their moral fall completed. From the 7th century unto the 15th century, the Greek empire of Byzantium had gradually "relapse[d] into barbarity." This argument allowed the author in *The Maga* to state that the Turks had actually begun a moral and spiritual revival in Greece. All the current wealth of the Greeks in Constantinople and the Peloponnese could be ascribed to the Ottomans themselves.[304] This, of

[303] Ibid., 444.

[304] "The Greeks and the Greek Cause," 467-469. A decided dislike of the Byzantine Empire had long been established in European thought hundreds of years before the Greeks began their Revolution. See Dimiter G. Angelov in his article "Byzantinism: The Imaginary and Real Heritage of Byzantium in Southeastern Europe," taken from *New Approaches to Balkan Studies,* eds. D. Keridis, E. Bursac, and N. Yatromanolakis (Dulles: Brassey's, 2003). Starting with medieval European historians slandering the Greek empire as treacherous and false, Byzantinism as a negative conception of the Byzantine Empire only grew. Angelov notes that a belief that the Byzantines failed to properly develop a split between church and state in government in turn leads to a belief that the Balkans are doomed to a semi-modernity. It was in the so called Age of Enlightenment especially that the Byzantine Empire became, in the eyes of all of Europe, a blight. Hegel wrote that the Byzantines were, in essence, no more than a highly civilized eastern, Oriental civilization. This of course made their heritage different from the European heritage. If one could then connect the modern Greeks to the sins and weaknesses of the Byzantine Empire, as the Tories attempted to do, then one could denigrate the Whig attempts to use the modern Greeks to ignite a new campaign against oriental tyranny.

course, meant that the Turks had done their due justice as legal sovereigns over the region and that the Greeks were illegally rebelling.

This, however, was at the cost of arguing, again much like Gibbon, that the religion of the Greeks was posturing falsely as Christianity. The author of this article argued that the Greek religion was really just a different branch of Islam. The Greeks and the Turks were mere "sectarian branches" of the same religion. Therefore, any argument to help the Greeks was essentially the same as arguing to help the Catholics in a religious war against the Anglicans in England.[305] Additionally, the author stated that most of the people living in Greece were descendants of the Turks, and they worshipped Allah. What would happen to these poor innocents if the barbarous Greeks won? They would be slaughtered without mercy. It was their land too; they had lived there for generations. The Whigs at home in England wanted the government to illegally help the Greeks, "the offspring of that people, who, abandoned by every virtue of antiquity, sank into…the basest, the grossest, the most depraved of the human race."[306] Even admitting everything the Whigs believed about the classical nature of the Greeks, their claim to antiquity could mean nothing to the English now.[307]

In order to maintain the guilt of the Whig party—guilt of revolution and guilt of disorder and irreligion—the Tories had, in the case of the Greek Revolution, to prove the Greeks unchristian and illegitimate descendants of their supposed ancestors. When, for example, an author in another article published in *The Maga* maintained that the Whig pretext of interfering to help in a religious cause was a scandalous falsehood—that "religion has nothing to do with the matter"—he was relating the Whig efforts on behalf of Greece to other potentially similar efforts

[305] Ibid., 471.
[306] Ibid., 471.
[307] Ibid., 472.

which might be made in favor of the English Catholics. England had a constitution which protected the Church establishments of Anglicanism. When the Whigs used religious arguments to leverage in favor of Greece, they were also attacking the Constitution.[308] The Tory author had, of necessity, to defend his view of the Constitution. The Tory Constitution, however, if applied to the Turkish government, would still have had "tyrannical" Muslims over "fellow" Christians. It would be rhetorically easy, at least for the Whigs, to compare this attitude to keeping Catholic James to rule over Protestant Englishmen. Therefore, the Tory author had to cast the conflict as not in any way religious. This was, however, a decided lie. The Greek Revolution obviously had a part of religion to it. To say that religion had nothing to do with the matter now placed an additional burden of proof on Tory rhetoric. To say that Greek Christianity was in reality a brand of Islam was a ridiculous assertion—patently untrue.

Not all the Tory prints went so far as to try to maintain that the Greeks were not Christian. Some took a more moderate stance on the Greek Religion. Yes, there were perversions and many Greeks still worshipped like heathens, but the Greeks were certainly Christian. They would do well to amend and correct some of their perversions in order to slowly improve their education and civilization from its degraded existence.[309] Another article, published in *The Quarterly Review*, took the Whig attacks against the official Church stance on Greece and turned it on its head. Whigs took pride in the fact that the dissenting denominations gave more openly to the Greek cause. The author in *The Quarterly* mounted a counter assault by asking, if the Quakers and others claimed to be giving their money in relief of the suffering innocents in Greece, then why did they not equally give to the suffering Turkish innocents? If this was truly a

[308] "The Faction," 415-416.

[309] Anon, [John Barrow], "Modern Greece," *The Quarterly Review* 23, no. 46 (1820): 341-342. (See *The Quarterly Review under Gifford*, page 69).

Christian cause, then surely all true Christians should give equally to the sufferers. Because the Quakers and others did not give equally, they proved that they were really just like any other political groups. Therefore, this was not a Christian cause.[310]

The mishandling of the Greek loan raised by the Greek Committee also proved useful in Tory attempts to prove the Greek cause less than a religious Holy War. Many Greek Philhellenes described their cause as a Christian duty.[311] And yet, argued an author in *The Quarterly Review*—the same who attacked the Quakers—the greed and corruption apparent in the raising and spending of so much money for the Greek cause proved the whole thing more Jewish than Christian. "Heave, Hellas, heave the sigh," cried out the enthusiasts of Greece as they saw their so called noble warriors falter, "but Hebrew hearts be glad!"[312] These Hebrew hearts were the men of the Greek committee. The author reprinted a poem in his editorial:

> "Blest band! where Jew and Atheist, cheek by jowl,/ O'er Christian interests raised consistent howl;/…One cries, 'The cause is lost!' another, 'Zounds!/ Who cares? I've lost my four-and-fifty pounds.'/ Snuffles a saint, 'I sorrow for the Cross! But 19 discount is a serious loss'"

Let them weep over their "sacred cause of insurrection" as long as they stopped bamboozling all sensible Englishmen.[313] Let them act the fool; let them inflame the base passions of the Greeks, call themselves their saviors, all the while destroying them morally. The vast majority of Englishmen did not care for them or for their cause, according to this author.[314] It was not a Christian duty to fight for the Greeks; it was only pecuniary interests—openly betrayed in the

[310] Anon, "The Greek Committee," *The Quarterly Review* 35, no. 69 (1827): 226n.
[311] Ibid., 221.
[312] Ibid., 222.
[313] Ibid., 222-223.
[314] Ibid., 224-225.

corruption of the Committee—which inspired a small faction of foolish Englishmen to act. In a final pronouncement the author outdid himself. These men of the Greek Committee, according to him, were the same men who meant to destroy all governments and rebuild them in their own image and according to their own principles. A thousand years in the future, "when infanticide and such noble devices are recognized," these men might have their way over the course of human events. They applied their wonderful minds to the problems of every facet of society. No evil could escape their eyes. They wept over the tyrannies of King Sardanapalus and complained against the Pharaohs of Egypt, not because they had persecuted the Israelites, but rather, because they dared to rule as autocrats. "These antediluvian lawyers" and the "cause of the Greeks" put together made for fascinating and amusing reading, but God forbid they should ever be taken seriously.[315] This Tory author argued that the Whigs used a false religious fervor to line their own pockets while letting true Christian interest fall by the wayside. It was one way to deal with the Whig attempt to monopolize on the religious aspects of the Greek Revolution.

Some authors ignored religion almost entirely and attempted to argue against the Whigs from a position of expediency. According to these authors, the particular political situation of England made it impossible for the government to interfere on behalf of the Greeks. The question, no matter how much it might appeal to the hearts and sentiments of the English people, could only revolve around the expediency of intervention. Greek independence could never revolve around the Greeks alone because it affected many other nations and people in the area. As long as Austria and Russia were involved and could possibly move into the void left by a sudden abrogation of Turkish power; it would be best for the English government to move slowly. Greece would have to achieve her freedom and liberty slowly; she would have to prove

[315] Ibid., 233-234.

to Europe that she deserved it. If the Greeks followed this course, if they learned how to govern while fighting Turks, and if the fire of the fight cleansed them of the centuries long accumulation of dross, then it might be possible for them to take up the mantle of their own independence and maintain it in the face of Russian and Austrian interference. After many other "mights" and "maybes," the author admitted that it was doubtful "in the present advanced and progressive state of liberal feeling and sound knowledge throughout Europe, the subjugation of a Christian to a Mahometan [sic] power…can much longer be tolerated."[316] Arguments from the viewpoint of expediency, therefore, allowed some Tory authors to attempt to remove the stain of revolution form the Greek cause. This could then cleanse the philhellenes at home in England from the unwanted association with rebellion. Other Tory prints found attitudes like this utterly disgusting, "spiritless" and "conciliating."[317]

If the Tories had a difficult time with the Whig press's usage of religion and the Greek Revolution, they made more cogent points when they dealt with the Classicalist appeal. In the words of an author writing in *The British Critic*, it would not be right to allow ancient Greek history to denigrate all that we currently have. Certain men tried to set up Ancient Greece as an ideal model of "government and manners." It was wrong, however, when "reverence for antiquity [was] made a plea for undervaluing present blessings…when errors [of antiquity]…[were] made the murderous weapons of faction and unbelief."[318] This author said almost nothing of the modern Greeks or their conflict throughout his work. He was ostensibly reviewing a new edition of Thucydides, but in reality he was using ancient Greece to prove to contemporary Englishmen that their government was not worthy of emulation. For example,

[316] Anon, [William Haygarth], "The Cause of the Greeks," *The Quarterly Review* 28, no. 56 (1823): 482, 474-475, 477-478, 484-485. (See *The Quarterly Review under Gifford,* page 82).
[317] "The Faction," 407.
[318] Anon, "Bekker's Thucydides," *The British Critic* 17, (1822): 56.

"were we to judge of the Athenian character from [this history], we should attribute to that sprightly people a coldness of heart scarcely reconcilable with the sensibility they are known…to have displayed."[319] The Athenian government had been vacillating and unreliable. "Its insecurity, its capriciousness and unfeeling despotism, its unprincipled ambition" were constantly and consistently proved to the observer by a casual reading of their historians.[320] Thucydides, a historian of the Peloponnesian Wars, recorded a time of ancient Greek fratricide aptly suited to Tory attempts to destroy the Whigs attempts to use a fictive Greece for their own ends.

How was the Greek government one which ought to be held out for emulation, asked the Tories? Greek republicanism was worse than the French variety. According to the author in the *Critic,* the French had pretended to care about liberty and equality. These ideas would have been alien to the Greeks. The Greeks had no notion of "natural indefeasible rights."[321] Contemporary republicans in England talked much about the liberty of the people. The Greeks of old, however, would have shuddered at something so simple as the Habeas Corpus Act, which would have been an imposition on the power of the people. The English Whigs spoke much about the rights of the working man, but the Ancient Greeks cared not a whit for the rights of the working man. You were a slave if you worked for your living. [322] Why then had ancient Greece been so successful? Because the emphasis on aristocracy and heredity had been so important in Ancient Greece, the more wild dangers of democracy had been checked.[323] It seemed therefore, that the best of Ancient Greece was either a gross lie, a terrible misrepresentation, or due to the noble check of

[319] Ibid., 60.
[320] Ibid.
[321] Ibid., 61.
[322] Ibid., 64.
[323] Ibid., 65.

aristocracy. The implication of all of this was that the then contemporary Whig party was going out of its way to lie to the English people about how great Ancient Greece had been. Reality showed that Ancient Greece had not been that great, that it certainly did not deserve to be emulated today, and that the modern Greeks could not have a right to claim help based on their so called wonderful heritage.

An article in *The Quarterly* also took to this argument. Again, the ostensible purpose of the article was to review a new book of lectures about the Ancient Greeks. "Romantic and extravagant notions about Grecian virtue, Grecian freedom, and Grecian liberty" might appeal to minds not entirely versed in the histories of Greece. But they would not stand up to a thorough scrutiny.[324] The author was "well aware, that to a large class of persons, any attack upon the Greeks, or the ancient republics, amounts to a crime little less than sacrilege," nevertheless, it had to be shown that the Ancient Greeks had no respect for laws and private property.[325] For example, when the Athenians went to war, they often turned to direct appropriation of private property and ruinous taxation of the wealthy. The Greeks had "robbed and plundered" their citizens. That certainly did not speak well of their supposedly wonderful government.[326] Additionally, the judicial system of the Ancient Greeks could be shown to be somewhat lacking. The "smallest jury…consisted of 500 members." How could such a jury give objective justice? The judges were ignorant; the jury members never paid attention to the tedious proceedings of the court. Furthermore, everyone listened eagerly to the rhetorical babblings of the lawyers—more inclined to prejudice than "any sound dictates of reason or conscience."[327] The Greeks not

[324] Anon, [Thomas Mitchell], "Dalzel—Lectures on the Ancient Greeks," *The Quarterly Review* 26, no. 51 (1822): 246. (See *The Quarterly Review under Gifford*, page 76).
[325] Ibid., 255-256.
[326] Ibid., 256, 258.
[327] Anon, "Greek Courts of Justice," *The Quarterly Review* 33, no. 66 (1826): 336-338, 341.

only kept slaves, they kept innumerable numbers of them in the worst type of living conditions. They tortured criminals.[328] "Such were some of the plain and palpable defects of this ancient jurisprudence" to all contemporary observers.[329] The end conclusion of all these apparently obvious pronunciations was that:

> much of what modern Greece suffers by necessity, ancient Greece suffered by choice; that so closely are democracy and despotism allied, that, as far as property at least is concerned, the most slavish of European governments scarcely presents one odious feature which does not find a parellel [sic] in free-born Athens.[330]

The attack on Ancient Greece, the historical ideal which the Whigs used in their classicalist appeals, was meant to prove that anyone who thought warmly of the Greek democratic tradition was deceived. England owed nothing of her freedom, justice, or greatness to the ancient Greeks, and therefore the classical appeal to help the Greeks held no weight. The relative success of the arguments can possibly be shown in two articles found in *The Westminster Review* specifically engaging with the *Quarterly* reviewer on the subjects of private Greek property and Greek law.

The author of the article in *The Westminster Review* complained bitterly against the "*guerilla* force [emphasis in the original]" which illegally and unfairly attacked the poor Greeks from all sides. What did it matter that the Ancient Greeks had a few sins? Even the reviewer in *The Quarterly* admitted to the greatness of the Ancient Greeks. What *The Quarterly* and their friends were really upset about was that the Ancient Greek republics offered up a vision of a successful society which functioned without a king and with "perfect freedom of discussion."[331] The truth was that there had been something special about the Ancient Greeks; their religion had

---

[328] Ibid., 346.
[329] Ibid., 354.
[330] [Thomas Mitchell], "Dalzel—Lectures on the Ancient Greeks," 264.
[331] Anon, "Periodical Literature—Quarterly Review," *The Westminster Review* 3, no. 5 (1825): 233-234.

fostered the development of all their people instead of rejecting the worth of some in favor of others. "Taking [their] defects at the utmost, and comparing the Grecian democracies with any other form of government…we have no hesitation in pronouncing them decidedly and unquestionably superior.[332] The Tories rightfully interpreted Whig fascination with the classical Greeks as a threat to the stability of the contemporary English government. In response they specifically attacked the source of all the Whig rhetoric on the subject. The often violent counter argument, as exemplified here, shows that at least some of their attempts to transfer the stain of Jacobin guilt to the ancient past hit home.

In spite of the relative ingeniousness of Tory counter attacks against the classicalist appeal and often as a result of the relative ineptitude of Tory attempts to deal with the Whig religious advantage, the Tories found in Greece a difficult issue to rhetorically manage. There are numerous small examples of the delicate line the Tory prints often had to walk. An author writing in *The Maga* noted that when talking about the legality of the Greek Revolution, the justification of the conflict had nothing to do with the discussion. The "partialities and wishes in favor of the Greeks…have nothing to do with the question before us."[333] "Doubtless," wrote an anonymous author in *The Pamphleteer*, "a natural wish amongst all Christian nations [is] that a people so connected with the fondest images of our imagination…should obtain a better return for its sufferings, and should more nearly accomplish its independence."[334] It was certainly a tragedy, wrote an author in *The Quarterly*, that the Greeks, as the progenitors of civilization, should be so crushed under "Asiatic barbarism." These thoughts were enough to awaken any

[332] Anon, "Institutions of Ancient Greece," *The Westminster Review* 5, no. 10 (1826): 270, 278, 293.
[333] "Battle of Navarino," 26, 28.
[334] "The State of the Nation," 54.

sensitive person to Greek suffering.[335] Another unidentified author in *The Quarterly* wrote that even though "policy [was] a cold and passionless principle," it was unfortunate that "the land of literature, of philosophy, and of independence should be at this day trampled under the feet of ignorant barbarians."[336] Tory authors were aware of the unpopularity of their message about the Greek Revolution. They had to openly apologize for its seeming illiberality and close-handedness. They often openly recognized the appeal of seeing a free and independent Greece. They appealed to their audience to look beyond such partialities, demanded that they had nothing to do with the real questions at hand, and urged their readers to consider the dangerous principle of interfering in the name of a rebellion. Such an action would destroy the principle of the English presence in India or even in Ireland. The comparison was clear. Helping the Greeks would be the same as helping the French Revolutionists in 1789. One had to look beyond the partialities and see that the Sultan was just as legal in his rule as had been Louis XVI. Was there then no real legal difference between an Oriental and Occidental monarch?

This was a difficult position to maintain. Often support for the Greeks and their revolution slipped through the cracks. An article published in *The British Critic* argued for a strange settlement of the situation. Tsar Alexander, in return for liberating Poland, could assume overlordship of the Greeks and Constantinople. This would be a noble compromise which would save the Christian Greeks from the Muslim Turks. The Greeks were fighting for "religion, and lives, and property, and for all that every nation in Europe except themselves possess." Additionally, the then contemporary Sultan, Mahmud II, was not a legitimate monarch because

[335] [William Haygarth], "The Cause of the Greeks," 474. Is it interesting to note that the editors expressed serious concerns about publishing the article and openly admitted that the contents had been seriously censored.

[336] Anon, "Reconstruction of the Federative Policy of Europe," *The Quarterly Review* 38, no. 75 (1828): 184.

he had murdered his predecessor and taken the throne. Therefore, there was no reason not to interfere in favor of the Greeks.[337]

This article was published early in the conflict before, as a later author writing in *The Critic* would complain, Greece became the watchword of a faction. However, it is interesting to note an early Tory spin on the situation. The author had just celebrated the talents of Ali Pasha, the Albanian satrap who ruled over most of Greece in the name of the Sultan. He continued this line and advocated for another absolute monarch to step in and take control of the entire region of Greece—Turkey be dammed because the Turkish monarch was not legitimate. This was no Whiggish outcry for liberty; it was rather a uniquely Tory solution to the problem of the suffering Christian Greeks. They should be ruled by a co-religionist in the form of the Russian Tsar. Furthermore, because *The British Critic* published this article so early, the author was able to upbraid the Whigs and their followers who had supported the Neapolitans in their revolt. According to the author, the Whigs had supported the Neapolitans because they fought for the freedom of the press, and had not, as they ought to have done, supported them according to true Christian compassion. Because they only cared about the freedom of the press, they did not care about the poor Greeks.[338] Later on this religious argument would be monopolized by the Whig prints; this early Tory response shows that the later Whig monopoly was more a rhetorical victory than a natural development or association.

Another author, writing in the Tory leaning *Maga*, also spoke very favorably of the Greeks and of interfering to help them. Ever since the beginning of the conflict, the Greeks and the Turks had been slaughtering each other. Supposedly however, the Turks were far worse. The Turks had openly declared, wrote the author, their intention of killing all the Greeks because they

[337] Anon, "Turner's Tour in the Levant," *The British Critic* 16, (1821): 99-100.
[338] Ibid.

were Christian. Could England sit quietly by and allow this to happen? No, was the answer, a thousand times no. It was the "common duty of humanity" to stop this madness. The massacre on the island of Scio proved the barbarity of the Turks. Theirs were crimes whose noxious smoke reached to the throne of God, and he would judge the nations if they failed to stop the Turks.[339] Importantly, the author justified any retaliation against the Turks by pointing out that these massacres made null and void any treaty England might have had with them. Essentially, Scio and other actions like it made the Turkish government illegal; their inveterate hatred of Christianity made their government illegitimate.[340]

Again, this article was an early response to the Greek Revolution—written before the final entrenchment of the conflict. Again the Tory author made sure to connect his argument in favor of intervention to a justification of Ottoman destruction. It was, again, the specifically Christian aspects of the conflict which inspired a Tory print to publish an article justifying a rebellion against constituted authority. With other issues at home and abroad, the Tories were able to argue that God and Christianity could not be used to justify rebellion. However, when it came to Greece, the full application of Tory doctrine demanded that Christians "grin and bear it" under the admitted tyranny of Muslim overlords. For some the practicalities of the situation had to negate the doctrine. As a later article published in *The Maga* put it:

> "The time will come when for [such irreligious neglect] there shall be retribution; when Europe shall be ashamed of having stood by and looked upon the continued and reckless havoc of Christian life; and when even our own generous and sympathizing country will lament from her soul the scandal of having contented

[339] "The Congress," 654.
[340] Ibid., 654-655.

herself with entreaties and deprecations, when the thunderbolt that had already smote one empire of infidelity and massacre was still blazing in her hand."

Far from being able to maintain the comparison between the Greek Revolution and the French Revolution, it became hard for the Tory press to not compare the destruction of the Napoleonic Empire to a supposedly deserved destruction of the Ottoman Empire. Here then was a fully Whig argument published in the most rabid of the Tory periodicals. The Tories had long maintained that England had fought against the principles of the French Revolution—principles of rebellion and revolution. In face of the bloody horror of the Greek Revolution though, it was hard for some to see former distinctions. Instead of associating Greece with the French Revolution, it was the Ottoman Empire associated with the Napoleonic one.

A final way to look at the difficulties the Tories faced with the Greek conflict can perhaps be shown in the two very different reactions to the Battle of Navarino in 1827. Navarino essentially ended the war because it ended the Ottoman's ability to reinforce their troops with Egyptian auxiliaries. Both *The Quarterly Review* and *The Maga* published reactions to the battle. For *The Maga*, the battle was a betrayal of everything English. English conduct "in respect of Turkey and Greece [was] directly opposed to everything she previously professed and practiced; and it [was] utterly subversive of every obligation which…one nation owes to another." The three powers (England, Russia and France) had had no right to either demand negotiations or to send a fleet to enforce their will. The admiral in charge of operations should be called back to England to answer for his crimes. The act was an indelible stain on English honor. It was a destruction of all public law, and before long England would find herself swallowing her own tail as colonies and dependencies took up the right which England had freely given to the

Greeks.[341] Essentially, *The Maga* here argued that all legality of international law and sovereignty no longer existed because England had actively chosen to violate them.

An article in *The Quarterly*, on the other hand, justified the actions at Navarino. Turkey had, admittedly, once been part of the federated structure of Europe—part of the legal system in other words—but she was no longer. Navarino had made this so, and Navarino was justified because a "war of extermination, waged by a government against any portion of its own subjects" was a state of things which negated the rights of that government.[342] The author quoted Grotius and Puffendorf to prove the limitations of all governments who fought to suppress rebellion. The right to interfere was therefore established on a natural law existing first in precedence and now, apparently, available within the Tory viewpoint as a source for appeal. The only thing regrettable about Navarino, for this author, was that it did not fully accomplish the purpose of destroying the Turkish ability to wage war against the Greeks.[343] Grotius justified international intervention in the name of defending the honor and lives of those who were unjustly oppressed.[344] Here then was a Tory author justifying interference in Greece according to the principle of a natural law which gave certain rights to all men inherently. If not entirely going so far as to argue for inalienable rights of the subject, the Greek Cause certainly fit the bill as a "case of extreme injustice and oppression."[345] It turned out then, that the Greek Revolution was like 1688 (the Whig version), and the English, therefore, could rightfully help the Greek against the Turks.

[341] "Battle of Navarino," 25-26, 30-31, 32.
[342] "Reconstruction of the Federative Policy of Europe," 186.
[343] Ibid., 187-188.
[344] Skinner, 286.
[345] "Reconstruction of the Federative Policy of Europe," 187.

Rev. Hughes, in writing a second tract for *The Pamphleteer*, made a final attack against the Tory conception of the Constitution through the Greek conflict. In asking whether a political opponent would truly make the Turks "*legitimate* rulers over Christian subjects…bound to pay them [the Turks] unconditional obedience," Hughes turned to what he thought was the root of the problem. St. Paul, in Romans Chapter 13:1-2, had written that every man must be subject to the powers that God had put in place over him.[346] Hughes maintained that this was a mistranslation. It ought to be rendered '"Protecting Powers."' By this interpretation, "the law of Christianity [was] made to coincide with the laws of Nature and Reason."

> As long as we enjoy *protection* in all civil and religious rights, we are bound by Christian precepts to pay *obedience*; but if *iniquitous tyranny* take place of *protecting authority*, we are then not only absolved from our allegiance, but are authorized to repel the aggression and to vindicate our rights. How otherwise could the expulsion of James II from the throne of these realms be justified? [emphasis in original]"[347]

Here then was the crux of the matter, and the advantage which Greece gave to the Whigs. In no other situation arising during the years after the end of the French Revolutionary wars could the propagandistic value of tyrannical, arbitrary rule over an unoffending people better be exploited. The Whigs took a long established view of Greek history, which cast the Greeks as the progenitors of English freedom, and they used it to argue that because the Greeks had (fictively) enabled the English dispose of tyranny (James II), the English owed them an obligation to help the Greeks free themselves from their own tyranny (the Ottomans). Not only did Greek history

[346] Romans Chapter 13: 1-2: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation."

[347] Hughes, "Considerations on the Greek Revolution," 210-211.

stand in the good stead of the Whigs, so too did Greek Christianity. The Tories cast religion as a pillar of order and as a force against all rebellion. However, the principle of Tory religion when extended to its logical ends and applied to the Greek Revolution made it necessary to support Muslim rulers against a Christian populace. This was a largely unsustainable argument. In the rhetorical war between the two parties and their two interpretations, a situation which poked holes in the support of one party and not the other proved damaging beyond the normal measure. Because the cohesion of each party's arguments depended, in a large part, on proving the guilt of the other side, and because the Greek Revolution proved an issue difficult to associate with the French revolution—which was the locus of the Tory smear campaign—the supporters of the Greek revolution gained an edge. If the Whigs were right in their efforts to support the Greeks in their fight, then maybe the Whigs were right when it came to other matters as well. Maybe their interpretation of 1688 was truth and maybe their view of a Contractual constitution with a sovereignty inalienable, a legitimacy consensual, and a Christianity "in accordance with the laws of Nature and Reason" were correct. Greece, therefore, was a sign in whose name there was victory, and, in the Greek Revolution, James II was for once and all cast from his throne.

CONCLUSION

There was a spirit in the air, wrote an author in *The Edinburgh Review*. A spirit of change. On the surface there were many dangers and injustices still to be found across the world. However, as the old saying went, "the darkest hour is nearest the dawn." The great political upheavals of the age—France, Italy, Spain, Germany, Portugal and Greece—all of them together pointed to a new system for the entire world. "The thinking minds of all nations call for change. There is a deep-lying struggle in the whole fabric of society; a boundless, grinding collision of the New with the Old." The French Revolution had not been the beginning of this struggle; it had only been a part of it. Political freedom was only a part of it, an important part yes, but not the final goal. That goal was the "higher, heavenly freedom." The end result would be a reformation of the whole world—a slow process which "each [man] begins and perfects on *himself*. [emphasis in original][348] Greece was here cast as a part of a long and inexorable process which would inevitably result in the perfection of man. Dr. Price would have almost certainly celebrated this process. He, too, wrote of how the Revolution of 1688 had given security to the property of all Englishmen and at the same time freed the minds of the nation.[349] Approximately forty years later *The Edinburgh Review* connected the revolution in Greece to an interpretation essentially his.

By the end of the decade, in 1829, an author writing in *The Quarterly Review* seemingly vindicated the Whig view of the Constitution. Simply by identifying the beginning of the French Revolution as 1792 and not, as Burke would have said, as 1789, the author betrayed a

[348] "Sign of the Times,"459.
[349] Pincus, 51.

fundamental difference of opinion with his predecessors. True, as the author in *The Quarterly* noted, the French had set out to systematically destroy all their traditions and customs, their religion and government. Despite this, the end result, no matter how bloody, had been to improve the overall condition of mankind and had made it possible for man "to reason more comprehensively and correctly on themselves and their concerns."[350] The French Revolution gave a good example to the English as they now came to realize that "it is utterly impossible that every things established by our ancestors should remain untouched for ever in either form or substance." There were many things in the country which needed reformation and change; it was a serious duty which would not be easy.[351] To prevent revolution, change would have to be countenanced. This was for *The Quarterly*, a large change. It seemed that *The Quarterly* too sensed a change in the air, and as *de jure* principles gave way to *de facto* realities, the periodical still at least called for as much conservation as possible.[352] It seemed in both *The Quarterly* and *The Edinburgh Review* the spirit of the times would eventually result in a great and glorious culmination in the history of mankind. A reformation would lead eventually to man perfected; the process had already begun.

Here then one can see the birth of yet another type of Whig—neither a man, nor a political viewpoint, but rather an ideological conception of man and of history. The ideas of *The Edinburgh Review* are still with us now. The history of Whig history has already been written, and its ideas in the historical field have been mostly exploded. This work has dealt with a great deal of the triumphalist language which the Whigs, when they later gained political and conceptual control of England, eventually turned into the culminating historical victory of liberal

[350] Anon, "State and Prospects of the Country," *The Quarterly Review* 39, no. 78 (1829): 484-487.
[351] Ibid., 517-518.
[352] Ibid., 520.

freedom and democratic government. This supposed Whiggish victory came about in part because of the Whig party's ability to cast events on the continent, including the Greek Revolution, as a crisis dangerous to England. It also came about in part because of a Tory failure to maintain their doctrine and their own view of a different crisis also found on the continent.

What this work has perhaps not shown as well is the evitability of both the Whig victory and the Tory defeat. What the Whigs attempted to do in shifting the dominant interpretation of the English Constitution was an on-again off-again project of a varyingly excluded political party in England. The supposed continental assault against liberty with which the Whigs were able to associate the Tory government became a part of this project. The Greek Revolution was one of the many tools the Whigs used in order to accomplish their goals—goals which, as the best of all victors throughout history have done, they later painted as the triumphant culmination of the struggle between liberty and tyranny. The philhellenic and Christian aspects of the Greek Revolution intersected with Whig goals at an opportune moment. Tragedy occurred when the long established, influential, and fictive love of things Greek helped the Whigs create an equally fictive and perhaps equally dangerous conception of history and man's destiny. They reduced the Tory definition of the constitution into a caricature of itself, "old corruption." In a way they also made oriental what had been once an integral part of English history. Once the Whigs accomplished this step, they went on further and cleaned up the past as best they could. They perhaps occidentalized it. What had once been acceptable beliefs throughout English history now became absurd.

And so one comes full circle. The Romans called it *reductio ad absurdum*, that is, reduction to absurdity. But I think it natural and just to say, instead, as Aristotle would have

done, *eis atopon apagoge*.[353] This is what Greece made possible for the Whigs in the end. Both sides used these types of argument. It was an increasing reliance on them which, as this work has partially argued, made it possible, rhetorically, for Greece to have an effect on the dominant interpretation of the English Constitution. Whereas in other issues the Tories were able to show the absurdities of the Whig arguments, when it came to Greece, they were not so able. In the end, the Tory view, partially proved ridiculous through Greece, became unjust. There are, admittedly, many reasons the English repealed the Test and Corporation Acts, granted the Catholics political emancipation, and reformed Parliament. These were the acts which finalized the newly dominant Whig interpretation of the Constitution. Not the least of these reasons was the Greek Revolution and other events like it which, by making Tory doctrine absurd, contributed to its stultification and eventual destruction.

[353] The Greek phrase meaning "reduction to the impossible."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anon. [Barrow, John]. "Modern Greece." *The Quarterly Review* 23, no. 46 (1820): 325-359.

Anon. [Blanco, Joseph]. "Spain." *The Quarterly Review* 29, no. 57 (1823): 240-276.

Anon. [Chenevix, Richard]. "England and France." The Quarterly Review 25, no. 50 (1821): 534-575.

Anon. [Croker, John]. "Chateaubriand's Monarchy." The Quarterly Review 15, no. 30 (1816): 419-440.

Anon. [Hay, Robert]. "The Crisis of Spain." *The Quarterly Review* 28, no. 56 (1823): 536-560.

Anon. [Haygarth, William]. "The Cause of the Greeks." The Quarterly Review 28, no. 56 (1823): 474-493.

Anon. [Matthews, John]. "Hazlitt's Table Talk." The Quarterly Review 26, no. 51 (1822): 103-108.

Anon. [Mitchell, Thomas]. "Dalzel—Lectures on the Ancient Greeks." The Quarterly Review 26, no. 51 (1822): 243-271.

Anon. [Southey, Robert]. "Parliamentary Reform." The Quarterly Review 16, no. 31 (1817): 225-279

Anon. "Alien Law of England." *The Edinburgh Review* 42, no. 83 (1825): 99-174

Anon. "Anastasius." *The Edinburgh Review* 35, no. 69 (1821): 92-102

Anon. "Battle of Navarino." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 23 no. 84 (1828): 25-32.

Anon. "Bekker's Thucydides." *The British Critic* 17, (1822): 51-66.

Anon. "*Béranger's* Songs." *The Westminster Review* 10, no. 19 (1829): 198-215.

Anon. "Blaquiere's Review of the Spanish Revolution." *The British Critic* 18, (1822): 470-484.

Anon. “Buonaparte and the Elba MS.” *The Edinburgh Review* 30, no. 40 (1818): 444-463.

Anon. “Burgess’s Reflections on the Spirit of the Times.” *The British Critic* 14, (1820): 545-558.

Anon. “Carnot’s Letter to the King of France.” *The British Critic* 3, (1815): 158-165.

Anon. “Cashiering of Kings.” *The Edinburgh Review* 26, no. 52 (1816): 431-441.

Anon. “Dangers of the Constitution.” *The Edinburgh Review* 27, no. 53 (1816): 245-263.

Anon. “Demosthenes.” *The Edinburgh Review* 36, no. 72 (1822): 483-516.

Anon. “Dispositions of England and America.” *The Edinburgh Review* 33, no. 66 (1820): 335-431.

Anon. “Episcopacy Considered with a Reference to Modern Popular Societies.” *The Pamphleteer* 16, no. 32 (1820): 421-456.

Anon. “Foreign Policy of England.” *The Edinburgh Review* 28, no. 55 (1817): 106-125.

Anon. “France.” *The Edinburgh Review 25*, no. 50 (1815): 501-526.

Anon. “Greece and Russia.” *Greece and Russia* 1, no. 2 (1824): 453-471.

Anon. “Greece. No. III.” *Blackwoods Edinburgh Magazine* 20, no. 120 (1826): 824-843.

Anon. “Greece.” *The British Critic* 23, (1825): 1-25.

Anon. “Greece.” *The British Review and London Critical* 21, no. 42 (1824): 293-330.

Anon. “Greek Committee.” *The Westminster Review* 6, no. 11 (1826): 113-133.

Anon. “Greek Courts of Justice.” *The Quarterly Review* 33, no. 66 (1826): 332-356.

Anon. “Hallam’s Constitutional History of England.” *The Quarterly Review* 37, no. 73 (1828): 194-260.

Anon. “High Tory Principles.” *The Edinburgh Review* 41, no. 81 (1825): 1-30.

Anon. “Institutions of Ancient Greece.” *The Westminster Review* 5, no. 10 (1826): 269-331.

Anon. “Italy.” *The Edinburgh Review* 40, no. 79 (1824): 207-225.

Anon. “Kenny’s Principles &c of Pretended Reformers.” *The British Critic* 12, (1819): 40-52. 156-172.

Anon. “Late Sins of the Public Prints.” *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine* 4, no. 21 (1819): 353-358.

Anon. “Letter on the Spirit of the Age.” *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine* 28, no. 174 (1830): 900-920.

Anon. “Letters from France.” *The Edinburgh Review* 26, no. 51 (1816): 215-232.

Anon. “Liberty of the Press and its Abuses.” *The Edinburgh Review* 27, no. 53 (1816): 99-144.

Anon. “Memoirs of Europe.” *The British Critic* 23, (1825): 113-123.

Anon. “Men and Things in 1823.” *The Westminster Review* 1, no. 1 (1824): 1-18.

Anon. “Mr. Blaquierre’s Report on Greece &c.” *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine* 14, no. 81 (1823): 465-467.

Anon. “Naples.” *The Edinburgh Review* 35, no. 69 (1821): 72-92.

Anon. “On Parliamentary Reform.” *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine* 9, no. 50 (1821): 222-225.

Anon. “Partitions.” *The Edinburgh Review* 37, no. 74 (1822): 462-527.

Anon. “Periodical Literature—Quarterly Review.” *The Westminster Review* 3, no. 5 (1825): 223-261.

Anon. “Phillip’s Speech at Liverpool.” *The British Critic* 7, (1817): 48-52.

Anon. “Political Anticipations.” *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine* 28 no. 173 (1830): 719-736.

Anon. “Political Fallacies.” *The Westminster Review* 2, no. 4 (1824): 410-442.

Anon. “Politics of Switzerland.” *The Edinburgh Review* 37 no. 73 (1822): 137-164

Anon. “Portugal.” *The Edinburgh Review* 45, no. 89 (1827): 199-247.

Anon. “Present Policy and Future Fate of Arbitrary Governments.” *The Edinburgh Review* 39, no. 78 (1824): 281-299.

Anon. “Prospects of the Holy Alliance—Stability of the French Government.” *The Edinburgh Review* 40, no. 80 (1824): 514-542.

Anon. “Reconstruction of the Federative Policy of Europe.” *The Quarterly Review* 38, no. 75 (1828): 172-192.

Anon. “Reflections on The Conduct of The Allies.” *The Pamphleteer* 18, no. 35 (1821): 41-50.

Anon. “Remarks on the Principles of the Eclectic Review.” *The British Critic* 9, (1818): 194-205.

Anon. “Sign of the Times.” *The Edinburgh Review* 49, no. 98 (1829): 439-459.

Anon. “Sir William Gell’s Greece,” *The Edinburgh Review* 38, no. 76 (1823): 314-332.

Anon. “Sketch of the late Revolution at Naples.” *The British Critic* 14, (1820): 662-668.

Anon. “South America.” *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine* 15, no. 85 (1824): 134-144.

Anon. “Spain.” *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine* 14, no. 83 (1823): 675-694.

Anon. “Spain.” *The Westminster Review* 1, no. 1 (1824): 289-336

Anon. “State and Prospects of the Country.” *The Quarterly Review* 39, no. 78 (1829): 475-521.

Anon. “State of Parties and the Edinburgh Review.” *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine* 3, no. 18 (1818): 715-722.

Anon. “State of the Country.” *The Edinburgh Review* 32, no. 64 (1819): 293-309.

Anon. “Taylor’s Glory of Royalty.” *The British Critic* 14, (1820): 395-405.

Anon. “The Catholic Question.” *The Edinburgh Review* 45, no. 90 (1827): 423-445.

Anon. “The Congress.” *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine* 12, no. 70 (1822): 651-656.

Anon. “The Culloden Papers.” *The British Critic* 6, (1816): 149-172.

Anon. “The Declaration of England against the Acts and Projects of The Holy Alliance.” *The Pamphleteer* 18 no. 35 (1821): 1-41.

Anon. “The Faction.” *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine* 22 no. 81 (1827): 403-431.

Anon. “The Greek Committee.” *The Quarterly Review* 35, no. 69 (1827): 221-236.

Anon. “The Greeks and the Greek Cause.” *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine* 12, no. 69 (1822): 467-472.

Anon. “*The Holy Alliance* verses *Spain*.” *The Edinburgh Review* 38, no. 75 (1823): 241-264.

Anon. “The Illiberal.” *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine* 17, no. 98 (1825): 340-344.

Anon. “The Liberal System.” *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine* 16, no. 93 (1824): 442-455.

Anon. “The Present Administration.” *The Edinburgh Review* 46, no. 91 (1827): 245-267.

Anon. “The State of Europe and The Holy Alliance.” *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine* 15, no. 86 (1824): 317-333.

Anon. “The State of the Nation.” *The Pamphleteer* 20, no. 39 (1822): 1-92

Anon. “The States of Wirtemberg.” *The Edinburgh Review* 29, no. 58 (1818): 337-363.

Anon. “The Warder.” *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine* 6, no. 32 (1820): 206-212.

Anon. “Turner’s Tour in the Levant.” *The British Critic* 16, (1821): 90-104.

Barker, Edmund. “A Letter Addressed to the Rev. T.S. Hughes.” *The Pamphleteer* 21, no. 41 (1822): 189-207.

Bass, Gary. *Freedom’s Battle: The Origins of Humanitarian Intervention.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2008.

Billington, Richard. *Fire in the Minds of Men: Origins of the Revolutionary Faith.* New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2011.

Brewer, David. *The Greek War of Independence: The Struggle for Freedom from Ottoman Oppression.* New York: Overlook Duckworth, 2011.

Burke, Edmund. *Reflections on the Revolution in France: A Critical Edition.* Edited by J.C.D. Clark. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001.

Byron, George. "Modern History Sourcebook: Lord Byron: The Isles of Greece." *Fordham University.* November 1998. March 31, 2015. http://legacy.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/byron-greece.asp

Clark, J.C.D. *English Society 1660-1832: Religion, ideology and politics during the ancien régime.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Clogg, Richard. Editor. *The Movement for Greek Independence: A Collection of Documents.* New York: Barnes & Noble, 1976.

Cocks, John, Lord Somers. "Lord Somers' Defence." *The Pamphleteer* 10, no. 20 (1817): 329-369.

Crawley, C.M. *The Question of Greek Independence: A study of British Policy in the Near East, 1821-1833.* New York: Howard Fertig, 1973.

Darton, Robert. *The Forbidden Best-Sellers of Pre-Revolutionary France.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1996.

de Llano, José, Count of Toreno. "Count Toreno's Pamphlet &c." Translated by William Walton. *The Pamphleteer* 17 no. 33 (1820): 1-44.

Dyer, George. "Four Letters on The English Constitution." *The Pamphleteer* 12, no. 24 (1818): 405-460.

Estrada, Alvaro. "Representation to Ferdinand VII in Defence of the Cortes." Translated by Charles Toplis. *The Pamphleteer* 14, no. 28 (1819): 305-380.

Fleming, K.E. *The Muslim Bonaparte.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.

Fletcher, Andrew. *The Political Works of Andrew Fletcher.* London: James Bettenham, 1737. Retrieved form Google Books.

Gell, Sir William. *Narrative of a Journey in the Morea.* London: Longman, Hurst, Rees Orme, and Brown, 1823. Retrieved from Google Books.

Gilmartin, Kevin. *Print Politics: The Press and Radical Opposition in Early Nineteenth-Century England.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Gilmartin, Kevin. *Writing Against Revolution: Literary Conservatism in Britain 1790-1832.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Halliday, Paul. *Habeas Corpus: From England to Empire*. Cambridge: Belknap Press, 2010.

Hughes, Thomas. "An Address to the People of England in the Cause of the Greeks." *The Pamphleteer* 21, no. 41 (1822): 167-205.

Hughes, Thomas. "Considerations on the Greek Revolution." *The Pamphleteer* 22, no. 43 (1823): 199-224.

Jarrett, Mark. *The Congress of Vienna and its Legacy: War and Great Power Diplomacy after Napoleon.* London: I.B. Tauris, 2014.

Keridas, Demitris, Ellen Bursac, and Nicholas Yatromanolakis. Editors. *New Approaches to Balkan Studies.* Dulles: Brassey's, 2003.

Mason, Nicholas. Editor. *Blackwood's Magazine, 1817-25: Selections from Maga's Infancy.* London: Pickering & Chatto, 2006.

McCabe, Ina. *Orientalism in Early Modern France: Eurasian Trade, Exoticism, and the Ancien Régime.* Oxford: Berg, 2008.

Montagu, Basil. "Thoughts on the Liberty and The Rights of Englishmen." *The Pamphleteer* 21, no. 40. (1822): 73-92.

Mussel, James. *The Nineteenth-Century Press in the Digital Age.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Peter, William. "Thoughts on the Present Crisis." *The Pamphleteer* 8, no. 15 (1816): 215-280.

Pincus, Steven. *England's Glorious Revolution 1688-1689: A Brief History with Documents.* Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2006.

Pleij, Herman. *Dreaming of Cockaigne: Medieval Fantasies of the Perfect Life.* Translated by Diane Webb. New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.

Schroeder, Paul. *The Transformation of European Politics 1763-1848.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.

Shine, Hill, and Helen Shine. *The Quarterly Review Under Gifford: Identification of Contributors 1809-1824.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1949.

Skinner, Quentin. *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought: Volume Two The Age of Reformation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

Spencer, Terence. *Fair Greece, Sad Relic: Literary Philhellenism from Shakespeare to Byron.* London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1954.

St. Clair, William. *The Greece Might Still Be Free* London: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Stites, Richard. *The Four Horsemen: Riding to Liberty in Post-Napoleonic Europe.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Voltaire, *Questions sur les Miracles.* Oxford: Sr. Henry Dashwood, 1765. Retrieved from Google Books.

Woodhouse, C.M. *The Philhellenes.* Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1969.